# The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXV, No. 1 JULY, 1951

CONTENTS

The Meaning of Mary's Compassion. Part I
*Thomas Urban Mullaney, O.P.* 1

The Theory of the "Lay State" . *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 7

Civiltá Cattolica Centenary. Part II . *Antonio Messineo, S.J.* 19

The Opinion of Catholics on Euthanasia . *C. J. Nuesse* 29

". . . And I Work." Part III . *Francis J. McGarrigle, S.J.* 45

The *Humani generis* and the Holy Father's Ordinary Magisterium . . . . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 53

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Rosary on the Radio . . . . . 63

Problems of War . . . . . 64

Disposing of Easter Candle . . . . . 65

Distribution of Holy Communion . . . . . 66

Vigil of Pentecost . . . . . 66

Divine Praises . . . . . 67

Blessing of Homes . . . . . 67

Musical Problem . . . . . 68

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1951, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Chaplain's Dilemma . . . . . 68

Problems about the Stole . . . . . 69

ANALECTA . . . . . 70

BOOK REVIEWS

Moral Aspects of Dishonesty in Public Office, *by William Joseph King* 75

Testimonia de Assumptione Beatae Virginis Mariae ex omnibus saeculis, *by Carlo Balic, O.F.M.* . . . . . 77

Geschichte des Alten Testaments, *by Paul Heinisch* . . 78

Great Catholic Festivals, *by James L. Monks* . . . . . 79

The Power of the Sacraments, *by Most Rev. George Grente* 79

Living the Mass, *by R. Desplanques, S.J.* . . . . . 79

**—SPECIAL—**

**ORDINATION OFFER**

- What better way to start a newly ordained priest on the path of priestly teaching and reading than a subscription to THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW. If you know of a priest who has been recently ordained, why not subscribe for him? Twelve times a year your thoughtful gift will bring renewed spiritual and intellectual inspiration, with gratitude for the giver. A Gift Card will be sent on your directive. Don't delay . . . write today. Subscription $5.00 . . . Special Seminarian Rate $3.50.
- For the special price of 50¢ on all new subscriptions received before July 31st, 1951, we will include our Special Commemorative Issue of the 10th Anniversary of Pope Pius XII. This issue separately sells for $1.00. Subscriptions must state "Ordination Gift."

***Address:***

**THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW**

**The Catholic University of America**

**Washington 17, D. C.**

# THE MEANING OF MARY'S COMPASSION

## Part I

The question of Our Lady as our Coredemptrix is but one part of the question of her mediation between God and man. Into that more general question we cannot enter here: rather we must suppose the fact, certain in Catholic doctrine, that Mary is our mediatrix[1] in a general sense. We note merely these qualifications of Our Lady's mediationship in general: (1) Christ alone is the *de se* sufficient mediator: Our Lady is *de se* insufficient and totally dependent on Christ from whom every aspect of her mediation is communicated to her. (2) Christ alone is the absolutely necessary mediator: Mary is hypothetically necessary to us, i.e. given the fact that God has willed, freely, to establish her as mediatrix under Christ; (3) Christ is the absolutely universal mediator; Mary is not; but she is a mediator for all human persons except herself.

Leaving aside, then, the question of Mary's ontological character as mediatrix we consider only the actual exercise of her mediationship. This is radically twofold. Mary is a mediatrix both in the *acquisition* of all graces, and in their *distribution*. By reason of the first aspect of her mediationship she is called Coredemptrix: for the work of the Redemption of men consisted in acquiring for us the grace of God. By reason of the second aspect of her actual mediating Our Lady is, very rightly, entitled the dispensatrix of all graces. In this paper, then, we are concerned

[1] In a mediator two things must be found: (a) *an ontological aptness*, i.e. in his own reality the mediator must be identified with neither of the extremes he joins under the precise aspect according to which he joins them; and (b) *the very office of mediating* by bringing the goods of one extreme to the other and vice versa (cf. *Summa theol.*, III, q. 26, a. 2). Mary is ontologically apt since by reason of her created nature she differs from God, and by reason of her divine Maternity she is raised above all men "ad fines deitatis attingens" (Cajetan, *Commentarius in summam theologicam*, II-II, q. 103, a. 4; cf. G. M. Roschini, O.S.M., *Mariologia*, 2nd ed., II [Rome, 1947], 248). She exercises the office of mediator by offering to God man's satisfaction (through Christ) and by bringing to men God's grace. The burden of this paper is precisely to treat of Mary's actual fulfillment of this first part of the office of mediator between God and men, and of its effect, viz. our Redemption.

only with the first aspect of Our Lady's actual exercise of her presupposed mediationship: her co-operation *with her Divine Son in the acquisition of grace for us: that is, her co-operation in our Redemption by Christ.* It is at once obvious that we are speaking, then, of a prerogative which is altogether peculiar to Our Lady, of an order essentially higher than that reached by any other Saint. Others mediate in the distribution of graces; Mary alone with Christ mediates in their acquisition as well. "Redemption" obviously is here taken in the sense of the actual work whereby grace was acquired for us all, rather than in the sense of our individual reception of grace.[2]

Since the fact that Mary is our Coredemptrix has already been so thoroughly and so profoundly exposed in a great number of studies, our task is not to prove the fact but rather to examine its meaning: not to establish the truth but to attempt to probe something of the implications of that great truth. We take as fundamental the proposition that Mary without Christ would be fruitless and meaningless: that Mary as Coredemptrix cannot possibly be understood save by analogy with Christ the Redeemer. Consequently in our attempt to delineate something of the meaning of this doctrine we shall do no more than to show, step by step, how Mary has participated from Christ something of His redeeming character and work. We shall indicate then (1) the fittingness of Mary as Coredemptrix; and (2) in what her Coredemptive work consisted, both in general, and in particular.

### I. THE FITTINGNESS OF MARY AS COREDEMPTRIX

St. Thomas, in his very first words about the coming among us of the Divine Redeemer, wrote that in the Redemptive Incarnation four divine attributes, so to say, are emblazoned: divine goodness and wisdom, divine justice and power.[3] As the divine attributes are eternally enshrined in Him who is the divine Redeemer so too must we find them in her who is His Mother and associate: for is she not the very seat of Wisdom, the Mirror of Justice, and Virgin most powerful?[4] Looking on her with the reverent eyes of

[2] Modern theologians often refer to the former as "objective Redemption," to the latter as "subjective Redemption." The older terminology would seem more exact, more meaningful; the newer, more artificial.

[3] *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 1, a. 1, *sed contra.*

[4] Cf. Litany of Loretto.

faith we see these attributes reflected: *goodness*—for God's infinite perfection overflows to make of woman, in whom human sin and death began, a principle of all our holiness and life; *wisdom*—for God marvelously uses, in man's victory over Satan, woman who had been Satan's own weapon in defeating man; *justice*—for as by the prideful disobedience of woman our enslavement had begun, so it is not ended without a woman's most abject obedience; *power*—for what can be greater than this, that even Divine life and joy should reach out to us through the strong, gentle hands of the Mother of Sorrows?

St. Thomas continues that the Redemptive Incarnation excites and intensifies in us faith and hope and charity: more than any other single fact it makes us aware of our dignity, even nobility. Analogously, Mary as Coredemptrix lends to our faith, fervor; to hope the exemplification of ultimate accomplishment; to love, tenderness and connaturality. And in her the glorious dignity of human personality has, forever, attained to its highest reach: woman was deeply, guiltily involved in the debasement of our nature: what greater dignity could be offered her, or our nature, than the divine and Coredemptive Motherhood which was Mary's? Through Adam, in union with Eve, come sin and death: by a miracle of God's mercy through Christ, in union with Mary, have come redemption and life. God's ways are wise indeed, and therefore ordered, beautiful.

Granted, then, the fittingness of the woman who should through God's own wisdom and goodness and justice undo woman's evil, folly, and injustice: it remains to examine precisely how Our Lady did, in fact, co-operate in our Redemption.

## II. THE COREDEMPTION IN GENERAL

Given that Mary is our Coredemptrix, given the fittingness of that fact, we must further attempt to determine precisely how Our Lady exercised her coredemptive function, in what specific actions she did co-operate in the objective work of redeeming us. Here again we must be guided by what we know of Christ, the divine Redeemer, for Our Lady is Coredemptrix in so far as she is associated with Him, in dependence on Him. She must then have been a co-worker in our Redemption in that way in which *He* worked for it.

Now assuredly any single action of Christ's would have been sufficient in itself to redeem us, had it been offered for our Redemption: for even the least of Christ's actions has a certain infinite value as the action of a Divine Person. Yet in fact while all of Christ's actions were meritorious and many of them had infinite satisfactory value, yet we were redeemed properly by Christ's Passion, and not by any other of His actions. His Passion is His most properly redemptive activity: for, as St. Thomas notes, in order that there be a true buying, a true redemption there is required not only a price which is equivalent to the thing to be purchased, but also its formal designation as price in the transaction, a designation mutually agreed to. St. Thomas adds that nothing that Christ did or suffered is, apart from Christ's death, the price agreed to in this Divine purchasing which is our Redemption.[5] Between the Eternal Father and the Incarnate Word the compact was made clear; we were to be purchased only at a great price, the greatest of all prices: that price which is the living Blood of the dying Christ. The Passion and death of the Lord constitute His properly redemptive work.

In what, then, did Our Lady's co-operation in Christ's redemptive work consist? Must it not be formally identified with her Compassion—for we are enquiring, note, about Mary's *exercise* of her coredemptive office, not about the radical foundation of that office. As Christ's actually redeeming work was His Passion, so must Mary's actually co-working in our Redemption be her Compassion: for very obviously she can formally and actually co-operate in a work only when that work is formally and actually being accomplished.

But what is Mary's Compassion? We shall delineate its main features in detail in the next section but from the beginning we must understand that the coredemptive Compassion of the Mother of God does not consist properly in her mere feeling of sorrow or misery at the sight of the sufferings of Christ. Similar emotions or feelings were experienced, certainly by St. John and the holy women who stood by the Cross of Jesus together with Mary: but they are not all of them by reason of that, our coredeemers. Rather the Compassion was a singular and personal privilege which seared and rent the heart and soul of Mary alone. It was not merely her

[5] Cf. *Quaest. quodlib.*, II, a. 2.

emotion, her grief: it was a true, though subordinate, and dependent, part in Christ's own Passion, a part offered together with that Passion for our Redemption; so that the total principle of our salvation is Christ's Passion together with Mary's Compassion. This Compassion was a formal, immediate participation in Christ's Passion precisely as that Passion was the price of our Redemption, and not merely as it was the suffering of one she loved. How this was realized in detail we shall examine in a moment; but the fact that Mary is Coredemptrix by reason of her Compassion is witnessed to by a whole host of doctors and ecclesiastical writers including Richard of S. Lawrence, Denis the Carthusian, most explicitly S. Albert the Great and St. Alphonsus.[6] It is sealed in the clear words of Pius X[7] and Benedict XV.[8]

### III. THE COREDEMPTION IN PARTICULAR: MARY'S COMPASSION

The determination of the details of Our Lady's Compassion, the penetration of precisely how that Compassion was, in fact, coredemptive, must again, rest upon an analogy, an analogy with Christ. For to see how she co-worked to redeem us, we must first know how He worked for that purpose.

St. Thomas with succinctness and completeness distinguishes five different modes according to which Christ's Passion achieved its effect:[9] by way of merit, of satisfaction, of sacrifice, of redemption in a restricted sense of the word, and of efficiency. A thorough understanding of the perfection and of the plenitude of our Redemption requires a grasp of all of these modes. Yet because the last—the question of efficiency—is concerned rather with the application to us of the fruits of Christ's redemptive act we shall entirely omit it from our consideration both of Christ's Redemption of us, and of Our Lady's Coredemption. There remain, then, for

[6] Cf. Roschini, *Mariologia*, pp. 315; 353.

[7] Cf. *Ad diem illum* (Feb. 2, 1904): "Ex hac autem Maria inter et Christum communione dolorum et voluntatis promeruit illa ut Reparatrix perditi orbis dignissime fieret. . . ." Cf. *ASS*, XXXVI (1903-1904), 453 f.

[8] Cf. *Inter sodalitia* (March 22, 1918): ". . . ita cum Filio patiente et moriente passa est . . . ut dici merito queat ipsam cum Christo humanum genus redemisse." Cf. *AAS*, X (1918), 182.

[9] Cf. *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 48.

our consideration these four modes: merit, satisfaction, sacrifice, and redemption.

The very order of these modes is important. Each adds a new, and more precise formality than that contained in the previous mode. Thus merit in the concrete is any supernaturally good work, done by one in the state of grace, in God's service, and therefore worthy of reward. Over and above this, satisfaction adds the note that the work done be *penal* both in character and in intent. The notion of sacrifice, in the present economy of salvation, is yet more precise. In general it designates the external offering of a sensible thing, through some change or destruction of it, made to God in witness to His dominion over us; but in the *de facto* order in which sin is a reality it is offered also to placate God whom we have offended by sin. The appeasing of God, the effective placating of Him, is what sacrifice adds over and above satisfaction[10] from the point of view of its manner of achieving its effect,[11] which is our point of view here, necessarily. Thus, as not each merit would have satisfactory value, neither would each satisfactory work constitute true, effective sacrifice. Yet more exact can be the notion of Redemption. This involves a complete, effective sacrificial liberation from slavery to sin and to the devil; and not all sacrifice implies such effective deliverance—for example the sacrifices of the Patriarchs and those of the Mosaic law did not truly redeem: they but foretold Redemption to come.

We must note that Christ's Passion not merely includes each of these modes but ideally, and perfectly, fulfills each. The Passion is one reality, yet so perfect that it realizes every conceivable mode of working for our salvation. For this is a divine work; therefore, no perfection possible and fitting to it can fail to be realized in it.

*(To be continued)*

THOMAS U. MULLANEY, O.P.

*Dominican House of Studies*
*Washington, D. C.*

[10] *Ibid.*, q. 49, a. 4.

[11] It is patent that the proper nature of sacrifice differs from that of satisfaction. This St. Thomas considers elsewhere; cf. *Sum. theol.*, II-II, q. 85, a. 3 especially.

## THE THEORY OF THE "LAY STATE"

In recent years a theory has been proposed by some theologians concerning the relation between Church and State which has justly aroused great interest among Catholic scholars. The chief proponent and defender of this theory in the United States is Fr. John Courtney Murray, S.J., who has written several lengthy articles in its explanation and support in the course of the last three years, the most recent article being that which is contained in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for May, 1951.[1]

According to this theory, it is the plan of God that the State (meaning an ordered civil society under a lawfully established government) is subject only to the natural law. In the words of Fr. Murray: "As the law for man emerges from the nature of man as elevated by grace, so the law for the state emerges from the nature of the state, which was not elevated by grace."[2] Fr. Murray asserts that of the Church's divine commission to teach all truth "the state, as the living action that is public order, directly 'knows nothing' (to use the phrase of Durandus, quoted by Bellarmine)."[3] He cites approvingly the view of John of Paris, according to whom: "The finality of his [the prince's] power is determined by its origin; it is of the natural moral order. The ministry of the prince is the ministry of human justice and law. . . . The prince has no direct function with regard to man's transcendent destiny, his supernatural life as a member of the Church. The limits of his direct power are set by natural law."[4] From this theory it follows, Fr. Murray continues, that the state—and evidently this holds even when the vast majority of the citizens and the rulers profess the Catholic religion—has no direct right to

[1] Cf. Murray, "Governmental Repression of Heresies," *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America*, Third Annual Meeting (Chicago, June 28-30, 1948), pp. 26-98; "St. Robert Bellarmine on the Indirect Power," *Theological Studies*, IX (1948), 491-535; "Current Theology on Religious Freedom," *Theological Studies*, X (1949), 409-32; "The Problem of 'The Religion of the State,'" *AER*, CXXIV, 5 (May, 1951), 327-52.

[2] *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America*, Third Annual Meeting, p. 30.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 73.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 56.

restrict the proselytizing activities of non-Catholic religious groups, as long as these do not disturb public order and peace. "If there are individuals or groups within society that deny the exclusive right of the Church, as the true Church of Christ, to preach the Gospel, and undertake to preach a gospel of their own, the state has no empowerment from the only source from which its empowerments come (the natural law) to forbid them, provided the tenets of their gospel are not incompatible with the order of justice and the manner of their preaching is not in prudent judgment a threat to the public peace."[5]

Fr. Murray believes that the view he supports represents the core of the principle laid down by Pope Gelasius concerning the radical dualism of Church and State, and suggests that the concept of the state which is "lay" but not "laicized" or "laicizing"[6] has been brought to the fore in recent years by the great development of our ideas of the processes of state, and particularly of the idea of the democratic state. "The general term of all this development in the political order has been the 'adult' state, conscious of the autonomy proper to its adulthood, not merely impatient of any political tutelage exercised from without by the Church, but rightfully free from such external tutelage because the means for its self-direction to right spiritual and moral ends exist within the political order itself—I mean the whole range of democratic institutions."[7] As to the fact that in past centuries the Church has claimed from civil governments a greater measure of recognition and of favor toward the Catholic religion than is contained in the concept of the "lay" state Fr. Murray says: "All the facts of the past and all the actions of the papacy can be given their true meaning only in the light of the particular historical situation which the papacy happened to occupy, not only in relation to the civil power but more especially in relation to the whole of society at the time. . . . Must one maintain, for example, that *Mirari vos* or *Quanta cura* said the last, definitive, immutable word

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 82.

[6] "Contemporary Orientations of Catholic Thought on Church and State," *Theological Studies*, X (1949), 188; *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America*, Third Annual Meeting, p. 64.

[7] *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America*, Third Annual Meeting, p. 63.

on the political problems which the so-called "modern liberties," for all their aberrations and false metaphysical premises, aimed at solving?"[8]

The theory of the "lay state" naturally has a strong appeal for the Catholics of our land since it is quite in harmony with the principle of "freedom of worship," so deeply integrated into American democracy, and with the American tenet that no particular religion has any right to special governmental favor and no citizen is to be restricted in the practice and propaganda of his religious beliefs as long as he does not thereby interfere with public order and the rights of his fellow citizens.

However, the most important question is not the practical adaptation of Catholic principles to actual conditions (for I do not think that any reasonable person will deny that in view of the conditions that prevail in the United States we have the most reasonable and most practical attitude toward freedom of religious worship), but rather the speculative problem as to the *theory* of the "lay state" in reference to Catholic teaching. Can this theory be harmonized with the doctrine of the Church? Catholic scholars should seriously and courteously discuss this question, with the hope that the problem may be visualized in its entire scope and with all its ramifications and that the true solution may emerge.

It must be emphasized that the fundamental problem centers about the obligation of civil rulers in their official capacity to obey the divine positive law of Jesus Christ rather than about their obligation to obey the laws of the Catholic Church. In other words, the real point at issue is not the relation between the State and the Catholic Church but rather the relation between the State and Christ the King. For, if the Catholic Church possesses the authority to exercise *jure proprio* functions involving a restriction of the rights granted by the natural law to civil rulers, the only possible explanation of this direct power on the part of the Church is the authorization of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. Unless Our Lord Himself imposed on the rulers of nations the mandate to submit in certain matters to the ruling of His Church, there would be no direct obligation on the part of these civil authorities to yield to the demands of the Church in those matters which, by

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 36 f.

natural law, would be within the scope of civil jurisdiction but which the Church claims as its own. Certainly, it would be a deplorable *petitio principii* to argue: "The civil rulers must yield to the Church's demands, because the Church so decrees." But, if Jesus Christ has actually granted the Church the authority over certain matters which civil rulers would possess by virtue of the natural law, it follows that civil rulers have a correlative obligation to obey the positive divine law in respect to these matters—in other words, that they have obligations in respect to Christian revelation.

Fr. Murray admits that civil rulers in their official capacity can be bound *indirectly* to respect and to approve the laws and customs of the Catholic Church—that is, through their obligation to grant to their fellow citizens the right to determine freely the course of their personal and family lives, as far as this is compatible with good order. Thus, he tells us that the State owes the Church the duty of "assisting in the creation of those conditions in society, political, social, economic, cultural—which will favor the ends of human personality, the peaceful enjoyment of all its rights, the unobstructed performance of all its duties, the full development of all its powers."[9] With respect to marriage and education he says: "When, as in the case, the laws of the family derive from positive divine or ecclesiastical laws, as well as from natural law, it is the duty of the state to invest these laws too with the formal legality that it has the power to confer and to do its part to create the conditions for their full observance by the family. But this duty derives formally from the natural law, the law of the state's own nature as servant of the family."[10]

Now, while it is quite reasonable to hold that certain rights can be granted to the Church in this manner, just as certain rights can be granted to her through concordats, the question still remains whether or not the Church also possesses certain rights granted to her by Jesus Christ which imply a limitation of the natural-law authority of the state. Certainly the tradition and practice of the Church seem to indicate that she does possess such rights, and that consequently the state is bound by divine positive law to recognize some restrictions of the rights it could exercise by virtue of the natural law. Whether this obligation of the state should

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 71.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 73.

be called "direct" or "indirect" (that is, through the mediation of the Church's rights) is a matter of little consequence as long as the idea itself is properly understood. I prefer to refer to it as a "direct" obligation, to distinguish it from the type of obligation admitted by the defenders of the "lay state" theory, imposed on the state through its duty toward its citizens. I am speaking of laws laid down for all states under the Christian dispensation—whether they be Christian states or not—by Jesus Christ, as King over civil rulers, by which laws they must yield to His Church in certain matters over which they would have jurisdiction by natural law. And since civil rulers could not be expected to yield in this matter without examining the claims of the Church, it is within the scope of their official duty to find out whether or not the Church is authorized by God to demand certain rights. In other words, the state may not (to use Fr. Murray's phrase) "know nothing" of the Church's divine commission, but must investigate the validity of its credentials. And since only the Catholic Church among all religious organizations has received the divine commission and can give adequate proof of its divine authorization, the state is bound *per se* to yield to the claims of the Catholic Church alone in those matters which involve a limitation of the state's natural-law authority.

In the pages of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* I have already endeavored to prove that the doctrine of the Kingship of Jesus Christ, proclaimed by Pope Pius XI in the Encyclical *Quas primas*, ascribes to civil rulers the obligation to obey the positive law of Our Saviour in their official acts.[11] Fr. Murray interprets the statements of the Pope as meaning that state or government or society is bound by the law of Christ "as determined by the action and end proper to each of these realities"[12]—which, in his theory, would mean that the state is subject to the law of Christ only to the extent of the precepts of natural law. Now, while the natural law can be called the law of Christ by *communicatio idiomatum*, the unqualified phrase "law of Christ" in Catholic theology ordinarily includes the precepts over and above the natural law, promulgated by Our Lord as Man. For,

[11] "Christ the King of Civil Rulers," *AER*, CXIX, 4 (Oct. 1948), 244-53.

[12] *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America*, Third Annual Meeting, p. 30.

even in His human nature He is the supreme Ruler of all men, both rulers and ruled. Naturally, the state cannot be bound by all the laws of Christ intended for individuals. The state cannot be baptized or receive the Holy Eucharist or strive for life eternal. But the state can be bound by the positive law of Christ in the sense that civil rulers as such can be directly (and not merely through consideration for the beliefs and desires of the citizens) bound to acknowledge in the Church of Christ the authority to exercise certain functions which otherwise would belong to the state itself by natural law, and to promote in certain respects the supernatural activities of the Church.

That the state is bound by the law of Christ in this meaning was stated clearly by Pope Leo XIII. "We mean by the law of Christ, not only the natural precepts of morality or those which the ancients received from God, all of which Jesus Christ perfected and brought to their highest state by declaring, interpreting and sanctioning, but also the rest of His teaching and all things expressly instituted by Him." Then, after stating that all men are bound to accept the law of Christ as taught by the Catholic Church, the Pope continued: "What holds in respect to private individuals is almost the same in respect to empires; these necessarily fall into disastrous plights if they swerve from the *Way*. The Son of God, the Creator and also the Redeemer of human nature, is the King and Lord of the world, and holds supreme power over men, both as individuals and as united by law. . . . Therefore, the law of Christ must prevail in human association and in society so that it is the ruler and teacher, not only of private but also of public life."[13]

Let us consider some particular instances in which the positive law of Christ imposes on civil rulers obligations over and above those imposed by natural law. When Our Lord was about to leave this earth, He bade the apostles to "make disciples of all nations" and to "go into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature."[14] This commission has always been interpreted by the Catholic Church as meaning that she may send her missionaries to any land, irrespective of the laws that may prevail

[13] Encyclical *Tametsi futura*, Nov. 1, 1900; *AER*, XXIII, 6 (Dec. 1900), 629.

[14] *Matt.* 20: 28; *Mark*, 16: 15.

regarding the entrance of foreigners and the preaching of religious doctrine. Such is the principle expounded in the Code of Canon Law when it states that "it is the right and the duty of the Church, independently of every civil power, to teach all nations the doctrine of the Gospel."[15] Surely, this implies on the part of civil rulers the obligation to allow the preachers of the Gospel to teach their people the truths of salvation—and this, in turn, implies the obligation binding the civil rulers to investigate the credentials of those who claim to bear a divine message, to find out whether or not their doctrine bears the seal of divinity. It is absurd to say that in such a case the rulers are bound to allow the preaching of the Catholic doctrine on the ground that the citizens have a right to the practice of their religion, because in the case visualized the citizens have not as yet accepted the Catholic religion. In other words, the right of the Catholic Church to preach the Gospel *independently of every civil power* implies an obligation on the state, imposed directly by Jesus Christ, to permit the legitimately delegated preachers of the Gospel to enter its territory and to announce their message to the people without hindrance. Surely, this is an obligation over and above the obligations prescribed by natural law.

Again, there is the matter of marriage impediments. According to the natural law, the right to establish impediments belongs to the civil authority.[16] On the other hand, under the Christian Dispensation the Church possesses the exclusive right to establish matrimonial impediments for baptized persons.[17] Whence have the rulers of nations the obligation to recognize this claim of the Church? The only logical answer is that they are subject to this obligation by virtue of the positive law of Jesus Christ, who has elevated Christian marriage to the dignity of a sacrament and committed to His Church the right to protect it by the establishment of marital impediments.

Fr. Murray proposes this explanation: "By the law natural to its being, which commands that the state be the form of the society that is given, the state reckons with the marriage code that is *aliunde* obligatory on its citizens. If it fails to do so, it

[15] Can. 1322, §2.

[16] De Smet, *De sponsalibus et matrimonio* (Bruges, 1927), n. 433 sq.

[17] Can. 1038, §2.

violates the law of Christ, if you will, but by violating the law of its own nature as a state."[18] In other words, as he had just said previously, the state is bound to adapt its marriage legislation to *the law binding on Catholic people of which the state is the political form.*

But this explanation fails to take into consideration the case of baptized persons who are not Catholics and do not wish to accept the marriage code of the Catholic Church. Fr. Murray is unfortunate in his reference to *the marriage code of the Church as binding on the Catholic people,* for, according to Catholic doctrine the marriage laws of the Church bind all the baptized, whether Catholics or non-Catholics, to the extent that the Church wishes them to bind. And his explanation of the "indirect" way in which the Church acquires the right to apply its marriage laws—from the fact that "it is the duty of the state to invest these laws with the formal legality that it has the power to confer"[19]—cannot be regarded as satisfactory. For example, if in a country whose citizens are, for the greater part, non-Catholics, the civil law determined as the age for valid marriage eighteen for a boy and sixteen for a girl, it would certainly be true that the state was acting reasonably and justly from the standpoint of the natural law. And, if a boy of seventeen and a girl of fifteen married, the civil authority would declare their union null and void—and such a decision would be reasonable and just from the standpoint of the natural law. Yet, if the couple in this instance happened to be baptized (though non-Catholics) the Church would regard their marriage as valid. On what grounds would the Church base its decision? Surely, not on the grounds that the state had found the marriage code of the Catholic Church prevailing among its people—for these are non-Catholics, quite content with the eighteen-sixteen age law—but on the grounds that Our Lord had imposed on civil rulers the obligation to accept the ruling of the Church regarding the conditions for Christian marriage, even when these differ from the state's own rulings within the scope of the natural law.

In this connection it is well to recall the declaration of Pope

[18] *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America,* Third Annual Meeting, p. 31.

[19] *Ibid.,* p. 73.

Pius VI, in his condemnation of the Synod of Pistoria, to the effect that the Church "always could and can *by its own right (jure proprio)* establish impediments for the marriages of Christians, which not only prohibit but even render invalid a marriage, and by which Christians are bound *even in the lands of unbelievers.*"[20] Evidently, the state is bound to recognize the Church's laws regarding marriage whether or not the (baptized or unbaptized) citizens acknowledge these laws themselves.

Another grave difficulty confronts the theory of the "lay state" in connection with the dissolution of the marriage bond with the approval or through the authority of the Church in the case of the Pauline privilege and the *matrimonium ratum non consummatum.* Although theologians differ regarding particular points in explaining these cases, there is common agreement that they rest ultimately on a dispensation from the natural law granted by Jesus Christ and applied through the ministerial activity of the Church. Now, if the civil authorities are to regulate their official conduct by the natural law alone, are they not obliged to reject the claim of the Church to be authorized to declare or to decree the dissolution of a marriage in contravention to the natural law? And, in such an event, would not the decision of the state, based on the natural law, dominate over the decision of the Church, based on the divine positive law, since in the event of a conflict of these two, the natural law prevails?[21]

Fr. Murray's answer to this difficulty is that by virtue of the natural law, the law of its being and action, the state is bound to accept the marriage code which is accepted by its Catholic citizens.[22] Now, while this might furnish a solution as far as the Catholic Church is concerned, it would lead to further serious difficulties. For, if a state "knows nothing" about the Church's divine commission to teach all truth—in other words, if it is obliged to show equal consideration to all religions—the civil rulers would be obliged to concede exceptions to the natural law of marriage to any religious group that claimed to have a right to it, as long as their marriage customs did not disturb the order of justice and

[20] *DB*, 1559.

[21] Noldin-Schmitt, *Summa theologiae moralis* (Innsbruch, 1939), I, n. 207.

[22] *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America,* Third Annual Meeting, pp. 31, 73.

the public peace. From this it would seem to follow that the state would be obliged to allow polygamy to a community of Mormons, claiming that this is permitted to them by divine revelation. At any rate, the "lay state" would be bound to allow divorce, even in the case of a *matrimonium ratum et consummatum*, to non-Catholics who accept this in their marriage code—at least if the reason alleged is adultery, in accordance with their interpretation of Matt. 19:9. If this be true, it is difficult to understand why theologians, and Pope Pius XII himself in his recent address to jurists, permit a Catholic judge to grant a civil divorce to a validly married (even non-Catholic) couple only when there are reasons of great weight.

In the theory of the "lay state" it is difficult to explain the law of the Church forbidding civil officials under pain of excommunication to arrest and to judge before the civil tribunal dignitaries of the Church, especially cardinals and bishops.[23] Now, while the natural law forbids an unjust sentence, it certainly does not forbid the officials of a state to arrest or judge citizens merely because they possess ecclesiastical dignity. Whence, then, does this immunity of the Church arises—an immunity which imposes on civil rulers a measure of restriction of their natural-law rights? It could arise, indeed, from concordats between the Holy See and governments; and doubtless it is included in some of the many concordats that the Sovereign Pontiffs have entered into with various governments. But, the general manner in which this legislation is expressed in Church law indicates that its origin is deeper, that this immunity of the Church has its ultimate source in the will of Jesus Christ, who granted this privilege to His Church in order that the dignity and the liberty of His earthly representatives might be more effectively maintained. And, correlative to this divinely authorized right of the Church is a divinely imposed obligation on the state to yield to the Church a portion of the right it would possess if it were subject only to the natural law. In this connection it is appropriate to note that Pope Pius IX condemned the proposition: "The immunity of the Church and of ecclesiastical persons had its origin from civil law."[24]

It is true that Fr. Murray admits the right of the Church to

[23] Can. 120, 2341.
[24] *DB*, 1730.

excommunicate temporal rulers for serious "ecclesiastical crimes."[25] But, in his theory, such crimes can be only violations of the natural law, since it is the only law by which a civil ruler is bound in his official capacity. This would hardly explain the excommunication inflicted on a civil official because of his violation of ecclesiastical immunity, which is the violation of a divinely granted privilege.

It should be remembered, also, that to have a knowledge even of the moral (natural) law in all its details, revelation is morally necessary.[26] How, then, can civil rulers know their duties of natural law unless they have recourse to revelation, as interpreted by the one authentic teacher of revealed truth, the Catholic Church? If a person tries to solve the moral problems connected with sterilization, euthanasia, contraception, etc., he will very easily go astray unless he relies on Christian revelation as proposed by the teaching authority of the Church. This involves the obligation to investigate which is the true Church. Yet, in the theory of the "lay state" the civil ruler "knows nothing" of the divine commission of the Church to teach all truth.

The fact that the primary object of the state is to promote the temporal happiness of the citizens offers no argument that the state is bound only by the natural law. For the *temporal* is not identical with the *natural*. A person cannot have true *temporal* happiness (that is, happiness in the present life) unless he enjoys *supernatural* blessings; and consequently, if the state is concerned with the temporal welfare of its citizens, it will have some concern for their supernatural happiness in this world. This does not, indeed, include the right to legislate or to pass judgment in matters referring to the life of grace which the citizens of the state should possess; but, according to Catholic tradition, it includes on the part of civil rulers the right to restrict non-Catholic propaganda and proselytising, as an influence calculated to injure the citizens in the temporal (though supernatural) sphere.

I have proposed some of the objections to the theory of the "lay state" which I believe the advocates of this theory should seriously consider. It must be very evident that this theory is a very definite and radical departure from what has hitherto been

[25] *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America*, Third Annual Meeting, p. 59.

[26] Encyclical *Humani generis*, *AAS*, XLII (1950), 562.

commonly regarded as Catholic doctrine regarding the obligation of the state to acknowledge and obey the law of Jesus Christ, and to recognize in His Church certain rights and privileges granted by divine positive legislation. Any defenders of this new theory who believe that it affords a means of smoothing the way toward a better understanding of the Catholic Church on the part of the non-Catholics in America should realize that the traditional ideas of the relation between Church and state provide all that is necessary to give assurance to fair-minded people that the Catholic Church constitutes no menace to the cherished spirit of liberty so dear to all our citizens. Catholics have no intention or desire of modifying the system prevailing under our Constitution, the system of allowing all our citizens full liberty of conscience, complete equality of all religious denominations before the law. But this does not require any compromise of the principle that Jesus Christ established a Church to which He gave special rights and immunities, to the end that it might bring to all men the message of His Gospel and the means of attaining life eternal.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

*The Catholic University of America*
*Washington, D. C.*

---

### CHARITY AND THE MISSIONS

Since Jesus Christ has proclaimed that the special sign of discipleship in Him is that we "have love one for another," can we give a mark of greater love for our neighbors than by assisting them in putting behind themselves the darkness of error and instructing them in the true faith of Jesus Christ? As a matter of fact, this type of charity surpasses all other kinds of good works inspired by love just as the mind surpasses the body, heaven surpasses earth, and eternity surpasses time. Every one that acts thus, inspired by love and according to the full measure of his ability, demonstrates that he esteems the gift of faith in the manner in which one should esteem it.

—Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical *Rerum ecclesiae,* issued Feb. 28, 1926.

# CIVILTÀ CATTOLICA CENTENARY

## Part II

### PERIOD OF DEVELOPMENT

It could easily have been seen from the objectives which *Civiltà Cattolica* set up for itself that its development would be impeded by those it opposed directly and by those who did not appreciate its purpose. Immediately after the publication of its program, even before the first regular number was issued, there was a serious protest from the government of Naples.[1] It was enough for the review to indicate in announcing its program that it intended to go along with any legitimate and just form of government for the absolutists of Naples to become alarmed. It took all the wisdom of Fathers Curci and Liberatore to convince Ferdinand II that the principles on which they operated were in conformity with Catholic doctrines.[2] But this protest was merely a foreboding of future events. Just a few months later, the government of Naples set up a bureau of censure with such police regulations on the press that it was impossible for the review to carry on as an organ of free discussion and criticism. On Sept. 21, 1850, Fr. Roothaan ordered that the administration, the writing, and the printing of the review be done in Rome. The November 1850 number was issued from Rome;[3] its leading article was entitled "The *Civiltà Cattolica* in Its Proper Place."[4] In this article, Fr. Curci deplored the attacks made on the review both "by the demagogues who hated all authority and by the monarchists who recognized no authority in this world except their own." Moreover, the police of Naples were given a new pretext for retaliation when Fr. Taparelli revealed "the insufficiency of secret trials and imprisonments without pronouncement of sentence" to check the activities of the conspirators in the uprisings in Milan and in the

[1] Cf. articles by P. Pirri in *Civiltà Cattolica*, 1924, II, 21-31; 397-406, 504-13.

[2] P. Pirri, *Carteggi del P. Luigi Taparelli d'Azeglio* (Turin: Biblioteca di storia italiana recente, 1932), pp. 289 ff.; "Le idee del P. Taparelli sui governi rappresentativi," *Civiltà Cattolica* (1927), II, 206 ff.

[3] P. Pirri, *Carteggi del P. Luigi Taparelli d'Azeglio*, pp. 586 f.; 590 f.

[4] *Civiltà Cattolica* (Series I), IV, 5 ff.

attacks against Emperor Francis Joseph in Vienna.[5] Considering themselves offended by his words, the police confiscated the issue. The furor aroused by this act, however, only increased sympathy for the review, and subsequently there appeared a marked gain in subscriptions.

Such police action against the review seemed to be only a passing difficulty, especially after Ferdinand II gave his assurance that there would be no more interference with circulation. The government, however, soon forgot its promise when a second article by Fr. Taparelli written in a spirit directly opposed to certain of its cherished tenets appeared in September of the same year, 1853.[6] From then on, before the review was allowed to enter Naples, it was subjected to very strict censorship, so much so that the editors felt that they would eventually have to suspend subscriptions in that area. Just a year later, the government made this decision for them; it was offended at the publication of *Memorie della Civiltà Cattolica*,[7] a book written by Fr. Curci and containing the history of the first four years of the review. Its treatment of the censorship imposed in Naples stirred that government to open hostility against the review.[8] This banning of the review, which was extended to all sections of the Kingdom of Naples by Nov. 18, 1854, meant the loss of three thousand subscriptions and also the loss of Fr. Curci to the staff. His dismissal was peremptorily demanded by the government, which threatened other reprisals against the Jesuits.[9] The losses suffered in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, however, were compensated by increased circulation in other parts of Italy where the review could carry out its program in freedom and without interference.

The unfavorable action of the government of Naples against the *Civiltà Cattolica*, however, did not avert criticism of it by the liberal press of the time, such as *La Riforma* of Lucca, *Lo Statuto* and *Il Nazionale* of Florence, and *Il Risorgimento, L'Opinione,*

[5] L. Taparelli, "I nuovi attentati e le vecchie istituzioni cattoliche," *Civiltà Cattolica* (Series II), I, 593 ff.

[6] L. Taparelli, "O Dio re colla liberta o l'uomo re colla forza," *Civiltà Cattolica* (Series III), III, 609 ff.

[7] C. Curci, *Memorie della Civiltà Cattolica* (Rome, 1854).

[8] P. Pirri, "Le idee del P. Taparelli sui governi rappresentativi," *Civiltà Cattolica* (1927), II, 401 ff.

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 505 ff.

and *Il Cimento* of Turin, which labeled the review an auxiliary to absolutism and a mercenary of Bourbonism. As a matter of fact, the *Civiltà Cattolica* was neither liberal nor reactionary. Its attitude toward the different forms of political regime was one of neutrality in conformity with the doctrine and the example of the Church. "We are for all and not for any one in particular; we are for all in which we find legitimate power, respect for authority, protection of rights, and superiority of religion; we are not for and we cannot be for any government, in which these conditions are not found," wrote Fr. Curci in presenting the review to the public in April 1850.[10]

It was the agnostic liberalism and the anticlericalism which inspired the conduct of the Piedmont parliamentary government that forced the *Civiltà Cattolica* to take a clear-cut position against the political reforms of the times. As to the parliamentary form of government itself, it might appear that the review would have been precluded in principle from attacking it. In fact, such was the appraisal of the situation in certain moderately liberal circles.[11] In Fr. Taparelli's long examination of the representative orders in society, comprising some fifty articles,[12] however, more than preoccupations with principle held his attention. He demanded to know why the forms of moderate government, which the Scholastics themselves considered excellent and which in the past had demonstrated themselves to be such, in these times had become so inordinate and ill-boding. The reason for the change he found in the fact that laicism and agnosticism, inherited from the French Revolution, had altered their character. The fine logic of Taparelli demonstrated that accord with the professed principles of the liberalism of the time was impossible. That this criticism, which Taparelli kept on a high plane of scientific discussion, hit its mark

[10] C. Curci, "Il giornalismo moderno e il nostro programma," *Civiltà Cattolica* (Series I), I, 18.

[11] One of these was the Count of Montalembert, whose relations with Fr. Taparelli, though always correct, were never cordial. See P. Pirri, "La critica del P. Taparelli agli ordini rappresentativi e l'apologia del Montalembert," *Civiltà Cattolica* (1927), II, 397-412; R. Jacquin, *Taparelli* (Paris, 1943), pp. 152 ff.

[12] These articles were later collected and published in two volumes, under the title *Esame critico degli ordini rappresentativi nella società moderna* (Rome: Tipografia della *Civiltà Cattolica*, 1854).

in exposing the equivocators in the so-called liberal camp, became very clear in the reaction it stirred up in the opposition press. Among the more energetic publications to enter the fray were *Il Risorgimento, L'Opinione, Il Constituzionale, Lo Statuto,* and *Il Nazionale.* These were old enemies; *Civiltà Cattolica* was at odds with them more than seventy times in its first series of issues.[13] A new review was started at this time, called *Il Cimento;* its express purpose was "to examine philosophically and in a serious and tranquil manner the strange principles of public law enunciated by the *Civiltà Cattolica.*"[14] Alternating their attacks with those of this tribunal, which was guided by Zenocrate Cesari, were the principal writers of the liberal press. In the latter group was Bertrando Spaventa, with whom Taparelli carried on a sustained controversy over an article which appeared in the Aug. 19, 1854, issue of *Civiltà Cattolica.*[15] Spaventa advanced his bitter attack against the review in the columns of *Il Piemonte* with a weekly summary entitled "I sabati dei Gesuiti."[16] The counterblast promised by *Il Cimento,* however, never went off. *Civiltà Cattolica* had the satisfaction of assisting at the death, first, of *Il Piemonte,* which lasted only a year and three months, and then, of *Il Cimento,* which was forced by a dearth of readers to amalgamate with *La Rivista Contemporanea,* a liberal magazine directed by Chiala, of which *Civiltà Cattolica* later on asserted that for ten years "neither living nor dead, but agonizing as a tortured soul in a body—whether embryo or skeleton, it is hard to say—it was the desperation not of its readers, for it never really had readers, but of its directors and editors."[17]

It was not difficult for *Civiltà Cattolica* to maintain an air of tranquility in its fight with liberalism as an ideology founded on worship of the individual and liberty. Much more delicate, however, was its position in a contest with a constitutional and legitimate government, such as the Piedmont Government, which in deference to the doctrines of liberalism passed the Siccardi law

[13] V. Gasdia, *La Civiltà Cattolica nei tempi presenti,* p. 209.

[14] "Il giornale *La Civiltà Cattolica,*" *Cimento* (1852), I, 33-38.

[15] *Civiltà Cattolica* (Series II), VII, 363 ff.

[16] These articles were published by Giovanni Gentile in *B. Spaventa, La politica dei Gesuiti: Polemica con la Civiltà Cattolica* (Rome: Giovanni Gentile, 1911).

[17] *Civiltà Cattolica* (Series V), V, 99 ff.; (Series III); I, 574-80.

abolishing ecclesiastical tribunals and was preparing itself for the suppression of religious orders.[18] The editors could not but criticize the government. This turned out to be a serious and trying task for the College of Writers, particularly for Taparelli, who had to align himself against his brother, Massimo, whose politics as prime minister of the Piedmont Government were disturbing to the Church.[19] Taparelli, nevertheless, did not spare his brother in his own direct writings, nor did he hesitate to comment firmly on the actions imputed to Massimo as head of the government by Pius IX in his famous allocution of Jan. 22, 1855.[20]

After the occupation of Rome and during the consequent "Questione Romana," *Civiltà Cattolica* held unswervingly to its well-defined purpose of defending the rights of the Church and of the Holy See. The events of September, 1870, forced the management to suspend publication of the last volume (Vol. XII) of Series VI and to transfer the business and editor's offices to Florence, where they remained until near the end of 1887. Publication was renewed early in 1871, and the first volume of that year is irrefutable testimony of the seriousness with which *Civiltà Cattolica* took up its duty to the Church in her struggle with the Italian State.[21] From that moment until the Concordat of 1929, the review's defense of the Pope was based on two principles: for the exercise of his ministry, it was necessary for the Pope to have absolute independence, which he could not have without a territory of his own; and the solution of the Roman Question must be the result of bilateral agreement. Hence, the insufficiency of the so-called "Guaranties," laws outlining the prerogatives of the Pope and the Holy See, passed by the Italian Parliament in 1871.

Moreover, since with the fall of the Pope's temporal power all phases of public life were being controlled by Masonry, which inspired the antireligious policies of the young government, especially with regard to schools, the review set out against it and without pity exposed its deceitful threats. This task was executed principally through the writings of Fathers Franco and Oreglia.

[18] See articles by Taparelli in *Civiltà Cattolica* (Series I), II, 120 ff.; IV, 541 ff.

[19] Cf. letter to Massimo d'Azeglio, January, 1851, in *Carteggi*, p. 316.

[20] *Civiltà Cattolica* (Series II), IX, 497 ff., 566 ff.

[21] The six issues of Vol. I of Series VII (1871) contain at least eleven articles on this point.

Besides unveiling the false foundations of the assumed rights of the State in education, these writers affirmed more concretely the educational rights of the family as against those of a State that was bent on destroying Christianity in the people. Others who contributed to this controversy were Fr. A. Pavissich and Fr. Barbera.

In the field of social problems, *Civiltà Cattolica* did not restrict itself to combatting liberalism but used its pages to point out the errors in every ideology of the past century which did not conform with Catholic doctrine. Accordingly, when the vision of materialism grew more distinct day by day and this new philosophy appeared to outdistance its rival, liberalism, the review, through the writings of Fr. Steccanella, a disciple of Taparelli, pointed out its insidious tenets and its practical dangers to society. By watching every new doctrine closely and by expounding Catholic thought clearly, the review prepared the social atmosphere for *Rerum novarum,* whose teachings it has never failed to emphasize even to this day.

In its intellectual apostolate, *Civiltà Cattolica* has always been guided by the doctrine left to the Church by St. Thomas Aquinas. For the wisdom of such guidance, the review is indebted in large part to Taparelli, who, in an epoch when Scholasticism was quite dead, labored with all his might to reintroduce it to the schools. He, who had followed with all the sincerity of a soul seeking the light of truth that ferment of uncertainty and confusion which marked Italian culture in the early decades of the nineteenth century and who had experienced its skepticism, after 1825, realized the force of Aquinas' scientific principles, their facile adaptation in a system of mental development, the enrichment of interior life they brought to any one who would become acquainted with them. First, as rector of the *Collegio Romano,* and later as provincial of Naples, he used every effort to promote the renaissance of Scholasticism in the schools of the Society of Jesus. To this end, he wrote several letters and articles to convince the superiors of the Society of the wisdom of encouraging the study of Scholasticism.[22]

[22] Cf. P. Pirri, "Il Taparelli d'Azeglio e il rinnovamento della Scholastica al Collegio Romano," *Civiltà Cattolica* (1927), I, 112 ff., 399 ff.; "Intorno alle origini del rinnovamento tomista in Italia," *Civiltà Cattolica* (1928), IV, 215 ff., 396 ff.; "La rinascita del tomismo a Napoli nel 1830," *Civiltà Cattolica* (1929), I, 229 ff., 422 ff.; II, 31 ff.

After many years of unsuccessful striving, his dream was crowned by the foundation of *Civiltà Cattolica* and the decision of the Society that it should treat Scholastic philosophy *ex professo*.[23] Fr. Curci's articles in 1852 were in the way of an announcement of the new field in which the review intended to carry on its activity.[24] In 1853, Taparelli himself initiated the return to St. Thomas with a series of articles under the title "Delle due filosofie."[25] These articles started a controversy which had a far-reaching echo in journals outside Italy. It was provoked by the head of the traditional school of philosophy, A. Bonnetty, who commented at length in the *Annales de philosophie chrétienne* about *Civiltà Cattolica*, which he presented as a new and authoritative supporter of traditionalism. The review, however, which did not want to lend itself to ambiguities, responded through Fr. Oreglia. The dispute went on until the Congregation of the Index, in condemning four of Bonnetty's propositions, put an end to it.[26]

More trying was the Rosmini controversy. Certainly, the doctrines of Rosmini were in no way shared by the College of Writers. In those days, ontologism was an active topic, and the editors of the review felt within their rights to discuss it freely. It should be noted, nevertheless, that in his long examination of this topic, Fr. Liberatore was aiming directly at Gioberti and not Rosmini, and that the controversy was kept always within the limits of the strictest propriety.[27] There was never any rudeness shown for the person of Rosmini; in fact, it was with more than simple gestures of courtesy that the review showed its esteem for this exemplary priest.[28] Fr. Giovanni Cornoldi took up the question later on; responsibility for the condemnation of the forty propositions of Rosmini is attributed in large part to his articles. Cornoldi is

[23] P. Pirri, "Intorno alle origini del rinnovamento tomista in Italia," *op. cit.*, pp. 400 ff.

[24] P. Curci, "Il fatto e il farsi della *Civiltà Cattolica*," *Civiltà Cattolica* (Series I), XI, 5 ff., 129 ff.

[25] P. Taparelli, "Delle due filosofie," *Civiltà Cattolica* (Series II), I, 369 ff., 481 ff., 626 ff.

[26] P. Oreglia, "La risposta a Bonnetty," *Civiltà Cattolica* (Series II), III, 571 ff.

[27] There are numerous articles on this controversy in *Civiltà Cattolica* (Series II), IV, VI, VIII; (Series III), II.

[28] P. Pirri, *P. Giovanni Roothaan* (Rome, 1930), p. 479. *Carteggi*, pp. 301, 307, 324.

connected principally with the years which preceded *Aeterni Patris* (1899), the encyclical which consecrated the cultivation of Thomistic philosophy in the schools. Another editor who continued the defense of Scholasticism in the review was Fr. Giovanni Busnelli, known for his ability as a student of Dante and for his writings on Italian idealism.[29]

Restricting ourselves now to the religious events in which the review played an important role, the first in order of time was the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. An article by Fr. Calvetti at this time had important results.[30] It advanced the idea that the definition of the dogma be joined with the condemnation of modern errors, inasmuch as it included the negation of rationalism, which denies original sin. This thought did not remain without echo, since from it was born the idea of the "Syllabus."[31]

The review gave particular attention to the Vatican Council, which was announced by Pius IX, June 29, 1868. Beginning with Series VII, it carried a chronicle of the events of the Council and of its debates. The third issue of February, 1869, reported a letter from France in which the writer expressed hope for a definition of the infallibility of the Pope which would give the death blow to Gallicanism. This was enough to make the review the focal point of a severe attack especially in France and Germany, where even men like Dupanloup and Döllinger accused it of trying to fix the program of the Council beforehand. Responsibility for the campaign for the definition of papal infallibility was made to fall principally on *Civiltà Cattolica*, and the imperturbed calmness maintained by the review in the controversy itself was interpreted as a sort of retreat. The review, however, was not ensnared by these attacks and throughout the Council it reported debates objectively, together with a long series of historical and doctrinal articles. In these days, it was encouraged by the confidence of Pius IX and of a great number of the bishops gathered in Rome.[32]

[29] *Civiltà Cattolica* (1944) II, 112 ff., 226 ff.; III, 21 ff., 148 ff.; IV, 26 ff., and *Rivista di filosofia neoscholastica* (1944), XXXVI, 68-69.

[30] P. Calvetti, "Congruenze sociali di una definizione dommatica sull'Immacolato Concepimento della B. V. M.," *Civiltà Cattolica* (Series I), VIII, 377 ff.

[31] *Carteggi*, pp. 330 ff.

[32] E. Cecconi, *Storia del Concilio Vaticano* (Rome, 1879), II, 367.

Americanism and the school controversy in the United States were among the principal events of the pontificate of Leo XIII which were covered in detail by the review. Some of the great questions of this Pope's reign have already been mentioned. Most of the important writing of this period was done by Fr. Brandi, who, before his appointment to the staff of *Civiltà Cattolica* in 1891, was a professor of philosophy and theology at Woodstock, Maryland, and also a frequent contributor to *The American Ecclesiastical Review*.[33]

Brandi enjoyed the utmost confidence of Leo XIII and was considered his official interpreter. This may be seen especially in the articles which he wrote on Anglican orders, Americanism, and on the biblical question after the publication of *Providentissimus Deus* in 1893. His writings were carefully observed by the liberals within the Church at the time.[34] Loisy, whose school had long since manifested its intention to free itself from the wise norms of the papal encyclical, could not agree with the conservative Brandi and the policies of the review, which later on in the time of Pius X was to denounce his radicalism.[35]

Modernism, which after taking over certain ecclesiastical circles in France moved into Italy, was continually under the scrutiny of the review, which never hesitated to pass its judgment particularly on the many organs of propaganda of which the movement availed itself. Though firm in its denunciation of the errors of Modernism, *Civiltà Cattolica*, however, never was wanting in moderation in its attack, which cannot be said for many Catholic periodicals of the time.[36] During these years, especially in the period immediately following the publication of the encyclical *Pascendi* (1907), the attack on Modernism was conducted by Fr. Enrico Rosa, whose articles in the review represent the most important contribution for the study of Modernism in Italy.[37] Buonaiuti, head of the

[33] During the years 1892-97, Fr. Brandi contributed no less than ten times to *AER*.

[34] Charles Maignen, *Nouveau catholicisme et nouveau clergé* (Paris, 1902), pp. 96, 100-107.

[35] A. Loisy, *Mémoires* (Paris, 1930), I, 334, 347, 355, 375. J. Rivière, *Le modernisme dans l'Église* (Paris, 1929), pp. 69, 126. *Civiltà Cattolica* (1904), I, 277 ff.; II, 33 ff., 136 ff., 421 ff., 456 ff.

[36] Rivière, *op. cit.*, pp. 274-86.

[37] *L'enciclica "Pascendi" e il modernismo* (Rome, 1909).

modernist school, who was often called to task by Fr. Rosa, characterized him as a most unfriendly person. No one wonders at this coming from Buonaiuti, but those who knew Fr. Rosa know that he was just the opposite.[38]

During the period between the two world wars, the review devoted itself principally to political and social problems of Italy, especially after the rise of Fascism. The dangers inherent in totalitarianism made necessary extensive clarification of the Catholic doctrine of personal rights.

### CONCLUSION

In this brief account, it has been possible to point out some of the principal events in the one hundred years of *Civiltà Cattolica* and to recall the names of a few of the many self-sacrificing men who served the review during this time. It was, perhaps, this self-sacrificing spirit more than any other natural force which assured the continuance of the review through the years and preserved unchanged its fidelity to its original ideal.

ANTONIO MESSINEO, S.J.

*Rome*

[38] E. Buonaiuti, *Il pellegrino di Roma* (Rome, 1945), p. 64. Cf. also *Civiltà Cattolica* (1938), IV, 481-96.

---

### THE DIGNITY OF THE PRIESTHOOD

Priests are "the stewards of the mysteries of God"; and therefore they must serve Jesus Christ with perfect charity and consecrate all their strength to the salvation of their brethren. They are the apostles of light; therefore they must illuminate the world with the teachings of the Gospel and be so strong in the Christian faith as to be able to communicate it to others, and follow the example and the doctrine of the Divine Master, in order to lead everyone to Him. They are the apostles of grace and pardon; therefore they must consecrate themselves entirely to the salvation of men and draw them to God's altar so that they may nourish themselves with the bread of eternal life.

—Pope Pius XII, in his exhortation *Menti nostrae*.

# THE OPINION OF CATHOLICS ON EUTHANASIA[1]

The teaching of the Catholic Church on the morality of euthanasia is clear and presumably well-known.[2] In view of the emphasis given to this teaching in school classes, sermons, public addresses to professional and lay groups, and in the Catholic press, and the condemnation of the practice by "the traditional conscience of the West," it may be expected that few Catholics would be inclined to express approval of so-called "mercy deaths." Some non-conformity among the faithful may be anticipated, however, as a result of (1) ignorance of correct principles, and (2) more or less deliberate acceptance of erroneous opinions which have been widely circulated.

Euthanasia certainly is not as repugnant to the minds of Americans as it was formerly, if the results of public opinion polls may be adduced as evidence. In 1939, the American Institute of Public Opinion reported 46 per cent of Americans as replying affirmatively to the question, "Do you favor mercy deaths under government supervision for hopeless invalids?" The breakdown of responses by age and sex is presented in Table 1. Results comparable to these were obtained when a similar question was asked of a national sample by the same agency in 1947: "When a person has a disease that cannot be cured, do you think doctors should be allowed by law to end the patient's life by some painless means if the patient and his family request it?" As may be noted in Table 2, the proportion of negative responses was approximately the same as in 1939.[3] The climate of opinion revealed in

[1] The research reported in this article was aided by a grant from the University Research Fund of The Catholic University of America.

[2] For a recent study, see Joseph V. Sullivan, *Catholic Teaching on the Morality of Euthanasia* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1949), which includes brief sketches of movements to legalize the practice.

[3] A local poll reported by the Minneapolis *Tribune*, Nov. 2, 1947, showed 36 per cent in favor of euthanasia, 55 per cent opposed, 3 per cent giving qualified approval, and 6 per cent expressing no opinion. An educational breakdown of favorable responses revealed 38 per cent of college, 41 per cent of high school, and 26 per cent of grade school levels approving. Another local poll, reported by the Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin*, April 16, 1948, indicated 36 per cent in favor, 50 per cent opposed, 6 per cent qualifying responses, and 8 per cent with no opinion.

**TABLE 1**
**NATIONAL AIPO POLL RESULTS ON EUTHANASIA, 1939***

| | Per cent approving euthanasia | Per cent disapproving euthanasia |
|---|---|---|
| National total | 46 | 54 |
| *By sex:* | | |
| Men | 49 | 51 |
| Women | 42 | 58 |
| *By age:* | | |
| Persons under 30 | 52 | 48 |
| Persons 30 to 49 | 44 | 56 |
| Persons 50 and over | 41 | 59 |

* As reported in the New York *Times*, April 23, 1939. "No opinion" responses were excluded from the tabulation.

**TABLE 2**
**NATIONAL AIPO POLL RESULTS ON EUTHANSIA, 1947***

| | Per cent approving euthanasia | Per cent disapproving euthanasia | Per cent reporting no opinion |
|---|---|---|---|
| National total | 37 | 54 | 9 |
| *By sex:* | | | |
| Men | 39 | | |
| Women | 35 | | |
| *By age:* | | | |
| 21-29 years | 46 | 47 | 7 |
| 30-49 years | 36 | 54 | 10 |
| 50 years and over | 33 | 58 | 9 |

* *Public Opinion News Service* release, June 21, 1947.

these returns is undoubtedly related both as cause and effect to the efforts of organized groups and petitioning physicians and ministers advocating propositions like those embodied in the poll questions. Further discussion of these efforts would be irrelevant to the present study, however.

The purpose of this paper is simply to report an estimate of the extent of non-conformity with Catholic teaching on euthanasia in selected Catholic groups. This estimate is based upon an inde-

pendent opinion survey, in which respondents were judged to be non-conforming when their responses to one or more questions on euthanasia indicated either approval of the practice or some degree of uncertainty about its morality in particular circumstances. In either case, responses are not in accord with Catholic teaching which allows of no exceptions in this matter. Reasons offered by respondents for their replies to survey questions are also reported and classified.

## THE DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH

The opinion survey from which the data were obtained was planned by a Catholic Opinion Study committee within the department of sociology of The Catholic University of America, and executed with the co-operation of departments of sociology in sixteen Catholic colleges and universities.[4] An opinionnaire constructed and pre-tested by the central committee[5] solicited from respondents personal data on twenty items, and expressions of opinion on thirteen items dealing with three issues: the use of the atom bomb, the admission of displaced persons to the United States, and the practice of euthanasia. Co-operating departments administered the opinionnaires to Catholic college students and to non-student groups which they were able to contact during April and May of 1948. All opinionnaires used in the present study were filled in by respondents during class periods or group meetings, except in the case of one non-student group in which they

[4] The committee consists of Rev. Thomas J. Harte, C.SS.R., Rev. Bernard G. Mulvaney, C.S.V., and the present author. The Reverend Paul Hanly Furfey, Head of the Department of Sociology, has given constant advice and encouragement. Objectives, procedures, and results of the survey are presented at length in a mimeographed publication of the committee, "Toward a Catholic Opinion Study; Preliminary Report on Survey I"; see also, Rev. Thomas J. Harte, C.SS.R., "Catholic Education as a Factor in Catholic Opinion," *The American Catholic Sociological Review*, X (1949), 13-30, and Frederick J. Dougherty, "Differentials in American Catholic Opinion on the Admission of Displaced Persons to the United States," unpublished Master's dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1949.

[5] In addition to logical analysis and pre-testing, reliability of the instrument was indirectly confirmed in application of a scale constructed by the committee and described in a mimeographed report, "The Rating of Advertence to Moral and Religious Implications of Social Issues Presented in an Opinion Survey."

were distributed during a group meeting and returned by mail. Anonymity was assured and protected during the administration of the opinionnaire. Co-operating departments were free to tabulate returns for local studies but were instructed to return all questionnaires to the central committee. All tabulations reported here are those of the committee.

Returns were received from 2,370 persons. Two high school student groups, one youth group of high school age, and non-Catholic students in Catholic colleges have been eliminated from consideration in the present analysis. As the accompanying tables show, the population of the present study includes 469 persons in eleven non-student groups, 1,368 students from ten Catholic colleges, and 34 Catholic students in two Newman clubs of mid-western state colleges. These classifications are treated separately in the analysis, which deals mainly with the non-student groups. Additional descriptive data are presented in the tables or text below.

Two limitations of this study must be emphasized. In the first place, a consideration of the procedures used makes it clear that no attempt was made to draw a scientific sample of the Catholic population. Hence the results cannot be generalized to apply to the Catholic population of the United States as a whole. While the groups surveyed represent varied age levels, regions, and social strata, the educational level of the non-student groups is biased upward, since nearly half of the respondents have had at least some college experience. The occupational distribution is correspondingly biased in favor of the professional and clerical groups. There is reason to believe, however, that the non-student and Catholic college groups are not unrepresentative of their kind. They simply represent limited segments of the Catholic population. The Newman clubs, on the other hand, are too small and too isolated to be taken as representative. On the whole, the study of these varied groups should have at least practical significance.

A second caution is necessary, inasmuch as the opinionnaire used provides a verbal test only and not a behavioral test of the respondent's atttitude. It cannot be predicted with certainty that respondents expressing opinions approving euthanasia would consent to the practice when called upon personally to make a practical decision, nor do the expressions of disapproval guarantee re-

fusals to consent on the part of those verbally conforming to orthodox Catholic teaching on the opinionnaire. At best, presumptions are cast but no more. The expression of a non-conforming opinion, however, is itself significant as evidence of ignorance or deliberate non-conformity, and hence deserves attention.

The items on the opinionnaire dealing with euthanasia were as follows:

Q. 10. Many people believe that doctors should be allowed to administer fatal drugs to people suffering from incurable diseases. Do you think that doctors should be allowed to do this?

Q. 11. In the event your state passed a law making this practice legal do you think it would be all right for doctors to do this?

Q. 12. Do you think it would be all right in very extreme cases of suffering?

Q. 13. In the event the patient and his relatives agreed to it would a doctor then be allowed to administer these fatal drugs?

Under each item space was provided for response as follows:

Yes ..... No ..... No opinion .....

Your reason: .....

.....

The analysis which follows is based upon both the categorical responses and the statements volunteered by respondents in support of these responses.

### FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH NON-CONFORMITY

Tables 3, 4, and 5 present identifying information for each of the groups surveyed and show the number of non-conforming responses for each group on each question. Since the morally correct response to each item dealing with euthanasia was "No," all "Yes" or "No opinion" responses were classified as non-conforming in this tabulation. Thus 25 per cent of the non-student respondents, 10 per cent of the Catholic students in Catholic colleges, and 29 per cent of the thirty-four Newman club members in state colleges gave responses to one or more questions which were in some respect morally incorrect.

**TABLE 3**
**NON-CONFORMING RESPONSES ON EUTHANASIA: ADULT GROUPS**

| Description of group | Number of respondents | Number not conforming | | | | Not conforming on one or more questions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Q.10 | Q.11 | Q.12 | Q.13 | |
| 1. Illinois metropolitan parish social club.... | 60 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 2. Michigan small city Catholic social club.. | 50 | 14 | 16 | 17 | 20 | 23 |
| 3. Michigan small city Catholic women's club | 32 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 4. Missouri metropolitan alumnae of Catholic women's college .... | 65 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 5. Ohio metropolitan alumnae club of Catholic women's college. | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Ohio metropolitan mothers' club of Catholic women's college. | 42 | 7 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 14 |
| 7. Pennsylvania metropolitan parish Holy Name Society leaders | 48 | 9 | 14 | 14 | 17 | 21 |
| 8. Pennsylvania metropolitan parish Holy Name Society auxiliary ..... | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 9. Pennsylvania metropolitan parish leaders | 41 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 7 |
| 10. Tennessee metropolitan ladies' Catholic charitable society ... | 25 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 11. Tennessee metropolitan men's Catholic fraternal society .... | 79 | 12 | 18 | 20 | 25 | 28 |
| Total ..... | 469 | 57 | 78 | 84 | 105 | 118 |
| Per cent of respondents in each category.... | 100 | 12 | 17 | 18 | 22 | 25 |

**TABLE 4**

**NON-CONFORMING RESPONSES ON EUTHANASIA: CATHOLIC COLLEGE GROUPS**

| Description of group | Number of respondents | Number not conforming | | | | Not conforming on one or more questions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Q.10 | Q.11 | Q.12 | Q.13 | |
| 1. Kansas women's college | 137 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 11 |
| 2. Minnesota women's college, class in sociology | 29 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 3. Minnesota women's college, classes in sociology | 131 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| 4. Missouri co-educational college, classes in sociology | 161 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 9 | 15 |
| 5. New England women's college | 91 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 12 | 18 |
| 6. New York men's college, classes in sociology | 134 | 9 | 8 | 12 | 17 | 20 |
| 7. Ohio women's college | 202 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 21 |
| 8. Pennsylvania men's college, class in sociology | 34 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 9 |
| 9. Pennsylvania men's college | 84 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 11 |
| 10. Wisconsin women's college | 365 | 4 | 7 | 11 | 21 | 30 |
| Total | 1,368 | 34 | 55 | 70 | 103 | 142 |
| Per cent of respondents in each category | 100 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 10 |

**TABLE 5**
**NON-CONFORMING RESPONSES ON EUTHANASIA: NEWMAN CLUB GROUPS**

| Description of group | Number of respondents | Number not conforming | | | | Not conforming on one or more questions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Q.10 | Q.11 | Q.12 | Q.13 | |
| 1. Midwestern state teachers college, Newman club | 20 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| 2. Midwestern state technical college, Newman club | 14 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Total | 34 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 10 |
| Per cent of respondents in each category | 100 | 9 | 15 | 26 | 21 | 29 |

Analysis of the reasons offered for affirmative responses to the questions discloses that not all of these respondents actually intended to express personal approval of euthanasia. Some were simply confused in applying ethical principles to the circumstances presented in the questions, as is shown in the classification of statements volunteered by non-student respondents (Table 8). This classification will be considered more fully below. It may be noted here, however, that 12 per cent of the 469 non-student respondents definitely indicated personal approval of euthanasia under the circumstances presented, and that an additional 7 per cent may be classified as approving inasmuch as they gave affirmative responses to the questions without volunteering statements of reasons.

Two approaches have been adopted in the attempt to determine factors related to non-conformity. The first involves the determination of the proportion of non-conforming respondents in each of several categories selected for analysis. These categories represent factors which, hypothetically, may be associated with con-

formity or non-conformity, e.g., sex, age, national descent, education, etc. The second approach involves the comparison of the non-conforming respondents with the conforming and with the total population on the basis of the respective proportions within each of the categories representing hypothetically significant factors, e.g., men constitute 58 per cent of the non-conforming, 37 per cent of the conforming, and 42 per cent of the total population of study. Tables 6 and 7 present the results of these two approaches. The statistically significant findings may be summarized as follows:[6]

(1) Men are found among the non-conforming in significantly greater proportion than women (Tables 6 and 7).

(2) Persons fifty years of age and over are represented among the non-conforming in significantly smaller proportion than among those conforming (Table 7).

(3) Persons having attended or graduated from college are found among the non-conforming in significantly smaller proportion than among the conforming (Table 7), and conform to Catholic teaching in significantly greater proportion than persons having attended or graduated from high school only (Table 6).

(4) Persons having attended or graduated from Catholic colleges are significantly under-represented, and persons without any Catholic schooling are significantly over-represented among the non-conforming (Table 7). The former conform to Catholic teaching in significantly greater proportion than those having attended or graduated from either Catholic high schools or Catholic grade schools or those without any Catholic schooling (Table 6). Persons attending or graduating from Catholic high schools conform in significantly greater proportion than those without any Catholic schooling (Table 6).

(5) Persons in professional and semi-professional occupations are significantly under-represented, and persons who are opera-

[6] Differences between proportions have been termed significant where there is less than one chance in 100 that the difference shown is a chance difference due to sampling. The formula used in the calculations was that for the standard error of the difference between proportions. See Charles C. Peters and Walter R. Van Voorhis, *Statistical Procedures and Their Mathematical Bases* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1940), pp. 182-85, formula 106.

tives or service workers are significantly over-represented among the non-conforming (Table 7). Professional and semi-professional workers appear among non-conformists in significantly smaller proportion than clerical, sales, and kindred workers; craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers; and operatives and service workers (Table 6).

Thus, the findings reported here show the Catholic respondents studied to be overwhelmingly opposed to euthanasia, as compared with the samples of the national population surveyed by Gallup. Age and sex variations shown in this study appear to be consistent with those reported for the general population, but educational attainment appears to produce virtually opposite results when the subjects of this study are compared with the general population sampled in a Minneapolis poll.[7] This is not surprising when Catholic schooling is taken into account. Finally, it seems likely that the differences found among the several occupational categories are produced by the relation of occupation to educational attainment under Catholic auspices. This is suggested particularly by a comparison of the proportions of non-conforming respondents among the 161 with some Catholic college experience (11 per cent) and among the 67 with college experience under other than Catholic auspices (30 per cent). The difference is statistically significant, and emphasizes the crucial role of Catholic schooling in imparting Catholic thinking.[8]

### EXPRESSED REASONS FOR NON-CONFORMITY

On the basis of reasons offered in support of their responses, the non-conforming respondents among the non-student groups may be divided into four categories (Table 8). The first category consists of the 29 per cent who offered no reasons for their replies to any of the questions in the series. It is obviously impossible to analyze their reasoning on the problem, but there would seem to be ground for presuming their personal approval of euthanasia.

A second major category includes respondents whose personal approval seems more clearly indicated. As shown in Table 8, 23 per cent of non-conforming respondents indicated their knowledge

[7] *Supra*, note 2.
[8] See Harte, *op. cit.*

**TABLE 6**
**NUMBER AND PER CENT OF NON-CONFORMING RESPONDENTS BY CATEGORIES (NON-STUDENT GROUPS)**

| Category | Total number of respondents in category | Number in category not conforming | Per cent in category not conforming |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total non-student population.... | 469 | 118 | 25 |
| *By sex:* | | | |
| Men ..... | 197 | 68 | 34 |
| Women ..... | 272 | 50 | 18 |
| *By age:* | | | |
| Under 20 ..... | 38 | 12 | 32 |
| 20-29 ..... | 177 | 41 | 23 |
| 30-49 ..... | 148 | 44 | 30 |
| 50 and over..... | 106 | 21 | 20 |
| *By marital status:* | | | |
| Single ..... | 207 | 46 | 22 |
| Married ..... | 241 | 69 | 29 |
| Widowed, separated, divorced | 21 | 3 | 14 |
| *By national descent:* | | | |
| Irish ..... | 97 | 27 | 28 |
| Other ..... | 372 | 91 | 24 |
| *By ethnic position:* | | | |
| First or second generation.... | 170 | 49 | 29 |
| Third generation or later..... | 299 | 69 | 23 |
| *By educational attainment:* | | | |
| College attendance or graduation ..... | 228 | 37 | 16 |
| High school attendance or graduation ..... | 187 | 63 | 34 |
| Grade school attendance or graduation ..... | 54 | 18 | 33 |
| *By Catholic schooling (highest level):* | | | |
| At college level..... | 161 | 17 | 11 |
| At high school level..... | 135 | 35 | 26 |
| At grade school level..... | 85 | 25 | 29 |
| None ..... | 88 | 41 | 47 |
| *By occupational status:* | | | |
| Professional and semi-professional ..... | 64 | 5 | 8 |
| Proprietors, managers, officials | 34 | 7 | 21 |

(Continued on p. 40)

TABLE 6 (Continued)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Clerical, sales, kindred workers | 132 | 38 | 29 |
| Craftsmen, foremen, kindred workers | 39 | 14 | 36 |
| Operatives and service workers | 43 | 21 | 49 |
| Housewives | 122 | 28 | 23 |
| Unclassified | 35 | 5 | 14 |

of the correct principle in offering reasons for negative responses to question 10, but failed to explain their "weakening" in responses to subsequent questions which presented more concrete circumstances. It should be noted that there were nearly twice as many affirmative responses to the last question on the series as to the first (Table 3). Of those who offered explanations of their approval, the largest proportion, 20 per cent of all non-conforming respondents, attempted to justify euthanasia on the familiar humanitarian or sentimental grounds. "It would help no one to see suffering needlessly," is a typical statement by a respondent in this category; one nineteen-year-old bank clerk, after indicating his own approval, admitted, "Although God would not see it that way." Another 4 per cent of these respondents offered no reasons but explained the conditions and procedures which they felt would safeguard against abuses of the practice. Two respondents were willing to approve "if the Church agrees," and in addition to them several classified in other categories showed their ignorance of Catholic doctrine by such statements as "Yes, the Church permits executions under state law," or "Yes, because the doctor would only have to answer to God, and I think God would forgive him," or "I really don't know but the Church would tell us" (these last two from persons with Catholic college background). One woman justified her approval eugenically, "In time it would improve the race in health."

Without expressing personal approval of euthanasia, some respondents nevertheless made erroneous judgments concerning the application of ethical principles to the circumstances presented. Thus, 5 per cent of those approving evidently meant to pass only upon the subjective guilt of the parties, not upon the objective norm governing their actions. "If the people actually believe they are doing right and the doctor is of the same opinion," or "If the persons themselves want it," were characteristic replies

**TABLE 7**
**COMPARISON OF NON-CONFORMING WITH CONFORMING RESPONDENTS AND WITH POPULATION OF STUDY**

| Category | Per cent of non-conforming in category (N = 118) | Per cent of conforming in category (N = 351) | Per cent of study population in category (N = 469) |
|---|---|---|---|
| *By sex:* | | | |
| Men | 58 | 37 | 42 |
| Women | 42 | 63 | 58 |
| *By age:* | | | |
| Under 20 | 10 | 7 | 8 |
| 20-29 | 35 | 38 | 38 |
| 30-49 | 35 | 30 | 32 |
| 50 and over | 16 | 24 | 23 |
| *By marital status:* | | | |
| Single | 39 | 46 | 44 |
| Married | 58 | 49 | 51 |
| Widowed, separated, divorced | 2 | 5 | 4 |
| *By national descent:* | | | |
| Irish | 23 | 20 | 21 |
| Other | 77 | 80 | 79 |
| *By ethnic position:* | | | |
| First or second generation | 42 | 34 | 36 |
| Third generation or later | 58 | 66 | 64 |
| *By educational attainment:* | | | |
| College attendance or graduation | 31 | 54 | 49 |
| High school attendance or graduation | 53 | 35 | 40 |
| Grade school attendance or graduation | 15 | 10 | 12 |
| *By Catholic schooling (highest level):* | | | |
| At college level | 14 | 41 | 34 |
| At high school level | 30 | 28 | 29 |
| At grade school level | 21 | 17 | 18 |
| None | 35 | 13 | 19 |
| *By occupational status:* | | | |
| Professional and semi-professional | 4 | 17 | 14 |
| Proprietors, managers, officials | 6 | 8 | 7 |

(Continued on p. 42)

TABLE 7 (Continued)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Clerical, sales, kindred workers | 32 | 27 | 28 |
| Craftsmen, foremen, kindred workers | 12 | 7 | 8 |
| Operatives and service workers | 18 | 6 | 9 |
| Housewives | 24 | 27 | 26 |
| Unclassified | 4 | 8 | 7 |

which suggest an appeal to subjective intention rather than moral law as the proper norm. Confusions about the nature of professional relationships may be placed in this same category. They are illustrated in such statements as the following: "If all concerned wanted it that way then the doctor would have to obey orders"; "It seems as though the doctor would not be at fault if he did, but he is using his own free will and can refuse"; "After the law has passed one individual cannot do very much about it."

Finally, misunderstanding may be imputed to the 4 per cent who seem to have interpreted "fatal" as implying something less than death, and the 11 per cent who probably intended to acknowledge the legality of a doctor's action under permissive legislation without approving of it morally. This is perhaps a charitable imputation in view of such statements as "The law is what we must abide by," or "The state wouldn't pass such a law," but it seems warranted for most respondents assigned to this category.

## CONCLUSION

It is unnecessary to summarize at this point the facts which have been outlined above. These facts are of special concern to Catholic ethicians and moral theologains and to Catholic educators. Whether they are viewed optimistically or pessimistically, as long as conformity to Catholic teaching on such a fundamental question as euthanasia is less than perfect a task of education remains to be done. In so far as this study may be used in estimating the extent of that task, it should be recalled that the level of educational attainment for the general Catholic population is much lower than for the groups studied, and that it is in the lower categories of educational attainment and occupational status that most non-conformity (though not all) is found.

**TABLE 8**

**REASONS OFFERED FOR NON-CONFORMING RESPONSES BY MEMBERS OF NON-STUDENT GROUPS**

| Type of reason offered in support of response | Number so responding | Per cent of all non-conforming responses | Per cent of total response (N = 469) |
|---|---|---|---|
| No reasons offered on entire series | 34 | 29 | 7 |
| *Expressions of personal approval of euthanasia:* | | | |
| No reasons offered for non-conforming responses after correct statement of principle on Q. 10 | 27 | 23 | 6 |
| Justification for humanitarian or sentimental reasons | 22 | 20 | 5 |
| No reasons offered, but expressions of approval "with safeguards" | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| No reasons offered, but expressions of approval "if the Church agrees" | 2 | 2 | |
| Justification for eugenic reasons | 1 | 1 | |
| *Ethical confusions without personal approval of euthanasia:* | | | |
| Justification by appeal to the subjective intention of the parties | 6 | 5 | 1 |
| Justification by appeal to the doctor's professional capacity | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| *Probable misunderstandings:* | | | |
| Intention to acknowledge legality without personal approval | 13 | 11 | 3 |
| Misunderstanding of "fatal" | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| Total | 118 | 101 | 25 |

Interpretations of the facts presented must be based upon the premise that only the attitudes of individuals have been enumerated by the procedures employed. The findings of this study offer no evidence that non-conformity with Catholic teaching on this subject is in any sense organized. In other words, within the Catholic fold there is no dissenting "public" opinion. There is, on the contrary, a significant relation between the increase of knowledge of Catholic teachings and conformity to them.

C. J. Nuesse

*The Catholic University of America*
*Washington, D. C.*

---

## Fifty Years Ago

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for July, 1901, contributed by Fr. Anselm Kroll, is entitled "Clergy Life Assurance." The author explains some general principles regarding life insurance, and then considers this topic in its application to Catholic priests. He tells us: "At one time it was proposed to start a new insurance organization which would operate exclusively among the Catholic clergy of the United States. The fear of failure prevented the project from being realized." He himself recommends a plan such as is conducted by the Roman Catholic Clerical Fund Society of the Diocese of Omaha, the object of which is to extend assistance to its members in case of disease, infirmity, disability or other necessity. . . . Under the heading "An Old Text in a New Garb," Fr. L. B. Palladino, S.J., of Missoula, Montana, discusses the words of Our Lord to His Mother at Cana: "Quid mihi et tibi est, mulier?" He believes the meaning to be "This [the lack of wine] should not be, on My and your account," and concludes that Christ thus implicitly declared that He would comply with her tacit request to remedy the situation. . . . In the Analecta we find the pontifical letter communicating to the Bishop of Rochester the authorization to grant at St. Bernard's Seminary degrees in philosophy and theology. . . . In the Conference section there is a letter objecting to the idea of a "chapel car," on the score that it is a Protestant rather than a Catholic notion. However the answer which is given is quite adequate to solve this difficulty. . . . There is also a reply from the Congregation of the Holy Office, forbidding the transmission of the Holy Oils by "express," and requiring that they be taken to their destination by a priest, or at least by a trustworthy layman specially deputed for that purpose.

F. J. C.

# ". . . AND I WORK"

## PART III

### III. HIS WORK PERFECTS THE WORKER

*Man is the Child of his Work*

Action, according to philosophy, is the perfection of being. Action is, in general, the purpose of being. God is infinite Act; and it is only when man through his human activity partakes of that infinite Act that he becomes the image and likeness of God. Christ tells us that He is one with His Father because, as His Father is eternal Act, so the Son is His Filial image in His work: "My Father worketh until now; and I work" (*John* 5: 17).

By instinct, the animal makes its efforts to supply its material needs. Hence, the work of the hoarding bee or ant, or of the nesting bird, has not the spirituality of human labor, which is the result of mind and will; nor has the animal the merit of labor which arises naturally from the free will. By their work, other creatures imitate God as their Creator. Because he works freely and merits, man imitates God as his Father; and he can say with Christ: "My Father worketh until now; and I work." God, the Infinite, only *gives* perfection to His work; man, the finite, also *receives* perfection from his work. Not only does the perfection of the worker, man, effect the perfection of his work, but the perfection of the work, grateful, as it were, develops the perfection of the worker. Thus the worker is wedded to his work. Thus both bring completion to one another; and without his spouse, work, man is incomplete. The "potency" of the effect, in receiving its "act" of perfection, is at the same time ineffably one with its cause, which thus also receives the perfection of its activity.

Man is a better worker because of his work. "Man is debtor indeed to his profession," as Bacon observes, not merely for his external needs that it supplies, but especially for the internal perfection which it generates in him and with him. The main purpose of working is not the perfection of the work but the perfection of the worker reflecting God's glory, which is the final purpose of both work and worker. Cervantes tells us in his *Don Quixote:* "Each of us is the child of his own works." No matter

how transitory seem the products of man, they endure for eternity in their perfection of the worker; in fact, there are no other really permanent products of human labor but human greatness. Thus "every man's work shall be made manifest" in his own everlasting character; and "the day of the Lord shall declare" (*I Cor.* 3:13).

The beauty and the wealth wrought in things about him work the beauty and the wealth of the spirit of man. This is too much in oblivion amongst us. Too many think that their greatness is the greatness of things wrought, that are not themselves. So Seneca tells us: "If you place me in a grand house full of riches and beautiful things, you do not make me better; this wealth and beauty is outside of me; it is not myself." We fashion the useful and beautiful in things only that they may fashion the useful and the beautiful in ourselves and others.

Idleness not only destroys the work which must be kept up, but also destroys the idler, who also must be kept up in his character and virtues. A building or machine soon goes to pieces through the idleness of its owner. "Through idleness of hands, the house droppeth through" (*Eccl.* 10:18). We must work, not only to create and acquire, but also to maintain and preserve ourselves as well as our property. A man's beauty of character and wealth of happiness must be found in labor; a man's disintegration of body, mind and soul is indicated by inability to work because of his abhorrence of it.

"Occupational therapy," self-dedication to work, is essential treatment for abnormal minds and lives. When the insane person can be brought to work constantly, he is generally considered cured. Idleness is the rust of the mind and of the spirit; and rust consumes and disintegrates immeasurably more rapidly than the friction of use. For health of mind, as well as for health of character, it is imperative that our mental faculties do not rust unburnished, brooding often over our souls' real or imagined injuries by time and the world, and above all, by injustice and ingratitude, instead of shining in industrious use.

Ceaseless toil like a constant refrain lulls our wounded spirit into unconsciousness of its wounds, and "works ease out of pain through labor," the necessary sorrow that shall be turned into joy; for only so can Christ's promise be a reality: "that your sorrow may be turned into joy . . . and your joy may be full" (*John* 16:24).

*Work Makes the Worker Skilled*

By learning, we work better; and we learn by working. Aristotle remarks that the harper becomes expert by harping; and in the same way, the virtuous man has become such by performing repeated acts of virtue. If we keep at a study or pursuit of excellence, we shall one day wake to find ourselves amongst the great ones in that excellence. "Toil is the sire of fame," says old Euripides. Trollope gives a maxim in use by a bricklayer: "'Tis dogged as does it." Together with a facility of doing arises a breadth of knowing and a depth of evaluating the factors connected with our occupation. It is really rare that persistence does not generate proficiency. For success, certainly laborious application can be less readily dispensed with than brilliancy of gifts. As the illustrious and laborious Cicero observes: "What is there illustrious that has not been attended by labor?" On the other hand, the worker who is not fired with enthusiasm for his work is the one most likely to be fired.

It is a trite observation that a life is by no means always productive and of worth in proportion to its native I. Q. or other natural gifts. In fact, abilities, making simple achievement very easy, have often proved to be an unsurmounted temptation not to give oneself to the constant labor needed for great achievement. One does not belong to a nobility merely because he exists, whatever be his lineage or gifts; for no noble human is exempt from the law of producing the goods in a noble degree. To the peaks of eminence there is but one ascent, laborious and persevering climbing. Peaks easily scaled have many on top of them. "Labor improbus omnia vincit." Only the labor which is "improbus," grievous, will reach those rarely attained heights of human and spiritual excellence, which forbid approach except at the price of heroic and lifelong, noble labor.

If we are not "ambitious for the better things" (*I Cor.* 12: 31), there is little reason for our existence. It is not difficult to point out great workers among the saints, but it is difficult to name saints who were not phenomenally active—at least in a life of prayer. The works of St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, St. Robert Bellarmine, and their success, are plainly the fruit of sweat and strain of the spirit; and their labor has won for them a permanently high place in literature as well as in heaven. Their

inspiration, as usual, was largely perspiration. Great men: great workers; this is the confession of great saints, artists, thinkers, leaders. Robert Louis Stevenson is justly admired as a master of style; and his naturalness, which is the acme of art, seems to have come as easy to him as for the brook to flow down hill. In a letter to a friend he writes: "I imagine nobody had ever such pains to learn a trade as I had; but I dogged at it day in and day out; and I frankly believe, thanks to my dire industry, I have done more with smaller gifts almost than any man of letters in the world." So true is it: "After industry shall follow wisdom" (*Eccl.* 10: 10).

Without an infinite capacity for taking pains, genius is abortive; in fact, genius has been called an infinite capacity for taking pains. A fair amateur painter, who was a nobleman and rich, asked Turner, the master painter, for an opinion on his painting: "My Lord," replied the master, "to become an excellent painter you need only poverty." Certain it is that wealth of work accomplished depends on our eagerness to use carefully those odds and ends of time which are found in our day like minute nuggets of gold.

*Chaperon of Morality*

Moral fiber, too, and steadiness of character grow strong in us through work. Temptation, that dogs the days of the idler, gets scant hearing from the worker. It does not offer us sufficient allurement to take us away from our work, when we are too busy to pay any attention to its attraction. Only in work man obtains freedom from the irrelevant. As a remedy for bad habits, industry is perhaps the easiest because it is the most natural and efficacious. The self-discipline which a habit of work engenders is the most powerful and the most pleasant chaperon of our morals. Work is the gyroscopic compass holding man to his course and goal amid the buffetings of emotion and the siren attraction to harmful ways. Penelope's fidelity to Ulysses was achieved in her work of weaving.

On the other hand, cleverness, speed of execution, talent, will not make up for want of industry. In fact, without industry, talents are momentum down "the easy slope to Hades." Experience testifies that the worst rogues are the brilliant ones; the clever idler

is the one who knows best how to reach that self-indulgence which drags him lowest. God's commandments are not only for His glory; man's own good and happiness and perfection are inseparably one with God's glory and merely another view of it. It is not without significance that, for man's human welfare, God made labor a commandment: "Six days shalt thou labor," a command of which we should not be forgetful while we duly contemplate the fact that on the seventh day we rest.

Work is one of nature's most civilizing agencies. Were man no longer obliged to work, he would quickly sink to the level of barbarity. Spiritually, bodily and mentally, unduly prolonged rest is moral rust. Work is consequently the means of advancement for man in all phases of his perfection. So important is industry to human living that its defect, sloth, is listed as one of the capital sins of man against himself, his neighbor, and his God.

A man's spiritual character is largely made or marred by his attitude towards his daily work; and his "spiritual treasure laid up in heaven" is in great part determined by it. Greatness of character and greatness of achievement are both largely determined by man's readiness to fulfill the commandment of work.

*Peace of Psyche and Dignity of Soul*

The tool wedded to our hand not only puts order into matter, it puts order into our mind, our emotions and instincts. It is not good for man to be alone with his emotions for any great length of time. His serenity and peace of soul must be developed and maintained by properly quieting the emotional turbulence of his mind. Man must have company and converse with his work in order to keep his mind off his thoughts. The constantly unoccupied are neurotic and the neurotic cannot occupy themselves in constant work. Importunate thoughts, depressing self-pity, temptations of many kinds demand an unoccupied mind to receive notice. Work breaks the insistent tread of emotions on the bridge of life; and thus they cannot reach that cumulative sway which will break down the strongest mental structure in a crash. Calloused hands are often the reason why souls are not calloused. "It is well with me," said Michelangelo, "only when I have a chisel in my hands." Work has been destined by Providence to be also the natural, as well as the supernatural, salvation of man.

Work develops in us, together with competency, the even more valuable habit of contentment, the ability to spend full days and swift flying days. The habit of industrious, sustained work assures us usually of success; and thus we learn to like what we do and we do not seek to do what we like, which is usually impossible and often otherwise unsatisfactory, even if we were able to do it.

Since pleasure is the feeling or emotion following satisfaction of a tendency, undoubtedly the normal exercise of our faculties in work is a chief source of much satisfaction, or pleasure. "Labor is a pleasure in itself," says ancient Marcus Manlius (*Astronomica*, IV), while the still more ancient inspired Word tells us: "To rejoice in one's labor, that is the gift of God" (*Eccl.* 5:19).

For man's nature, work is dignity. "A truly American sentiment recognizes the dignity of labor and the fact that honor lies in honest toil," Cleveland said in accepting the nomination for President on Aug. 18, 1884. The inferior degree of animals' nature is the fact that "they toil not, neither do they spin." Whether he be the day-laborer with his shovel, the skilled laborer at his bench, or the white-collar laborer as clerk, accountant, manager or owner, the laborer feels that he is dignified in his labor. It is not, as the simple Communist thinks, only the lower-bracket labor that resents superior airs assumed by the idle rich. All laborers rightly glory in the dignity of labor; and at times, the worker's greatest fear is the loss of his dignity in unemployment. There is equality in work, which the divine Worker, Christ, brought into labor of any kind; for He gave infinite worth of glory to God and of redemption of man to the action of the hammer and the saw in His hands.

There is the sense of soul-satisfying liberty in work, which arises from the realization that the work is freely undertaken. "Free men freely work. Whoever fears God, fears to sit at ease," wrote Elizabeth Barrett Browning in *Aurora Leigh*. The morality of labor arises from the sense of obligation of work, willingly fulfilled—unlike the work forced on its subjects by the Soviet State solely for the benefit of the State. Work is the figure and personification of the fruit freely produced. It is a figure of life which is the workday looking forward in hope to the product of life's work, Heaven.

Every man has a right from nature to the necessities of his

nature. This holds, not only as regards his material necessities, but above all, as regards his spiritual and character necessities. Work is as much a necessity for the development of the spirit of man, as the food and shelter, obtained by the work, are necessary for his material welfare. Man has a right not only to feed, clothe and house himself and his, but far more emphatically, he has a right to perfect himself in work. Correspondingly, the State has a much greater obligation to see that the worker has access to this spiritual perfection of living, than it has to give him opportunity for material support and comfort. It is not merely from the material aspect, but also from the spiritual, that William Channing is correct in his observation: "Labor is discovered to be the grand conqueror, enriching and building up nations more surely than the proudest battles."

*Man's Communion with Nature*

Work is the union of man with nature, as well as a prime union with his fellow man. The worker communicates with nature his own gifts, and receives in return its gifts. He gives to mindless things his intelligence in his designs for their improvement. He makes nature pregnant with the offspring of new energies, conceived in the wedding of his purposeful mind and potent matter. Man's work is his poetry, in the Greek meaning of the term: his creation. To the plans in his mind, which he makes real, he gives a local habitation and a name through a "poetic," or creative, energy. Man lives his poetry; his poetry is his life; and before it gradually dies away, it has given birth to other work poems in other men, in which he still lives as in his work's progeny and echoes. Human work is an ever-widening circular wave; and though men may come and men may go, in its influence on them its activity goes on forever.

Man, *homo faber*, has his glory of paternity among material things in the perfections of the fabricated works of his creative hand and mind; and thus also, he is made to the image and likeness of God who finds His glory in the reflection of His perfections in the perfections of His work. The instinctive urge that every man has to reproduce and manifest himself in his creations through labor, makes him like unto God in a way superior to that of all other creatures' imitation of God.

Still more intimate than his relationship with matter, developed through the worker's hands, is the relationship with matter developed through the worker's mind. The mind spiritually creates things, first in thought and essence, before the hands and will bring them into material existence. The conception of them in thought is by its very nature a spiritualized espousal of mind and matter, in which the mind, through the spiritual idea, is previously made like unto the projected material artefact, so that the material, through the will of the hands, may be given birth, in likeness unto the spiritual idea. As St. Thomas observes, after more ancient scholastics, in knowing the material object the knowing mind becomes by way of reflection the known object, since it becomes an image of the matter through its spiritual idea; and reciprocally, the model spiritual idea of the worker makes his material effect to its own image and likeness.

Man's intelligence, through his work, creates a sort of mystical union, composed of the spirit of man entering into the material world. Work links man in proper relationship with the non-human world; thus he preserves the intercommunion of all things, while they keep their proper station as servants of man.

This unitive bond between the work, thought about and known, and the mind of the worker, thinking and knowing, surpasses immeasurably the association of the mere exterior presence of things; and surpasses in some aspects even the union of effect with its efficient cause. Work, in a way, supernaturalizes matter in man, not only by grace, but also by raising matter with its laws, in union with his intelligent and voluntary nature, to a level of being which it could never have attained by its own laws. Obediential to the mind and will of man, it achieves a state supernatural to material nature. Thus in man's work matter wins victory over its material self and shares in the victory of man over the mere material. Still more, the matter of man's work attains victory over man in forming his character and in supplying his environment.

*(To be concluded)*

FRANCIS J. MCGARRIGLE, S.J.

*Seattle University*
*Seattle, Washington*

# THE *HUMANI GENERIS* AND THE HOLY FATHER'S ORDINARY MAGISTERIUM

There is one section of the Holy Father's encyclical *Humani generis* which has aroused a great deal of attention in our own country. It is the following paragraph, the one numbered "20" both in the NCWC translation and in the Latin text which was printed in last November's issue of *AER*.

> Nor must it be thought that what is expounded in Encyclical Letters does not of itself demand consent, since in writing such letters the Popes do not exercise the supreme power of their teaching authority. For these matters are taught with the ordinary teaching authority, of which it is true to say: "He who heareth you, heareth me"; and generally what is expounded and inculcated in Encyclical Letters already for other reasons appertains to Catholic doctrine. But if the Supreme Pontiffs in their official documents purposely pass judgment on a matter up to that time under dispute, it is obvious that that matter, according to the mind and will of the same Pontiffs, cannot be any longer considered a question open to discussion among theoolgians.[1]

Each sentence of this paragraph contains an important theological truth. The first expresses a sometimes obscured fact about the Holy Father's teaching activity. The second sentence brings out a truth which has not hitherto been set down very frequently in that section of theological writing dealing with the Holy Father's teaching power. It constitutes a striking contribution to theological literature. The third stands as a necessary inference from the first and the second sentences. It has definite and intensely practical implications for present day theologians.

The first statement of this paragraph condemns any minimizing of the authority of papal encyclicals which might be based on the subterfuge that the Holy Father does not use the fullness of his doctrinal power in such documents. The teaching of the encyclicals postulates an *assensum per se*, an acceptance by Catholics precisely because it is the teaching of the supreme doctrinal authority within the universal Church of Jesus Christ on earth. It demands such acceptance even when the Holy Father does not use *supremam sui*

[1] This paragraph is found on p. 10 of the NCWC translation. The Latin original of this paragraph is printed in *AER*, CXXIII, 5 (Nov. 1950), 389.

*Magisterii potestatem.* In other words, Catholics are bound to tender, not merely a courteous acknowledgment, but a genuine and sincere inward acceptance, to teachings which the Holy Father sets forth with a note or qualification less than *de fide* or even *doctrina certa.*

It is impossible to see the full meaning of this teaching without having an accurate understanding of what constitutes the *suprema magisterii potestas* of the Roman Pontiff. Here two distinct misconceptions must be avoided. This *suprema magisterii potestas* is in no way limited to the solemn teaching activity of the Holy Father, to the exclusion of the doctrinal pronouncements he makes in the ordinary manner. Neither is it in any way restricted to the primary object of the Church's doctrinal competence, to the exclusion of those truths which lie within what is known as the secondary object of the Church's infallible teaching power. The Holy Father actually exercises his *suprema magisterii potestas* whenever he issues an infallible or irrevocable doctrinal decision or pronouncement binding upon the universal Church militant. The mode or manner of such a pronouncement may be either solemn and extraordinary or ordinary. He may speak within the field of the primary object of the Church's infallible teaching power, or within that of the secondary object. In any case, where the decision is final and is addressed to and binding upon the universal Church militant, the utterance is an exercise of the *suprema magisterii potestas.* This holds true, we must remember, whether the statement be one of solemn judgment or an utterance of the ordinary *magisterium.*

The first declaration presupposes that documents or statements in which the Holy Father uses his *suprema magisterii potestas* demand acceptance by all Christians, and that such acceptance is due to these pronouncements by reason of the authority or weight of the pronouncements themselves. To this presupposition it adds the declaration that the papal encyclicals (and similar writings or oral statements addressed by the Holy Father directly or indirectly to the universal Church militant) demand a genuine acceptance on the part of Christians even where the *suprema magisterii potestas* is not employed.

In other words, the *Humani generis* here renews the Church's teaching that the Holy Father is empowered, not only to obligate

the disciples of Jesus Christ to accept, on faith or as certain, statements within the sphere of the Church's doctrinal competence, but also to impose the duty of accepting other propositions within this same sphere as opinions. The Roman Pontiff's commission and responsibility in the doctrinal line within the true Church are such as to demand the power to command doctrinal assent from the faithful for propositions which he teaches as less than certain, or as less than *de fide*. It lies within the power, and sometimes within the duty of the Roman Pontiff to command his people to assent to propositions which he himself presents as statements which eventually could be abandoned.

Basically, there is nothing new in this concept. The Sovereign Pontiffs have frequently stigmatized statements with a doctrinal censure less severe than that of heresy, and less severe than that of error. It has always been recognized as a fact that Catholics are obliged in conscience to accept these condemnations, and to reject the proscribed propositions inwardly and sincerely. In the last analysis, this process involved the command to adopt an opinion, since the Church, in designating a proposition merely as something rash or ill-sounding (to mention only two of these doctrinal censures inferior to those of heresy and error), has not given a definition or completely definitive judgment on the matter in question. The irrevocable decision is to be found only in the definitions properly so called, the designation of some propositions as *de fide* or as certain. Where the declaration is not irrevocable, it is not a definition in the strict sense at all. Properly speaking, such declarations call for an assent which is at once obligatory and opinionative in nature.

The *Humani generis* thus reasserts the right of the Roman Pontiff to command such an opinionative assent. When, in his encyclicals, or in any other documents or utterances of his doctrinal office, he imposes a teaching upon the members of the universal Church militant with anything less than his *suprema magisterii potestas*, he is calling for such an opinionative judgment. The faithful must, if they are to be loyal in their following of Christ, accept this opinionative judgment as their own. The obligation imposed by the encyclicals is not satisfied when a man merely allows that the teaching set forth in a non-infallible papal pronouncement is a respectable opinion. The followers of Christ,

guided by the teaching of Christ which comes to them in the declarations of His Vicar on earth, are bound to take that opinion as their own.

The day may come when that opinion will have to be modified. The Church allows for this possibility when it presents this teaching by other than an irrevocable pronouncement. When that day comes, the *ecclesia docens* within which Our Lord lives and teaches will realize that the holding of this opinion as it has hitherto been set forth is no longer requisite for the purity of the true faith in the actual circumstances then existent. Unquestionably the labors of the theologians and the other Catholic scholars throughout the world will have contributed to the formation of that judgment. But, when that judgment comes, it will inevitably be the work, not of separate scholars within the Church, but of the *ecclesia docens* itself. The voice of Christ the Teacher within His Church comes to us through the *ecclesia docens,* and never in opposition to it.

Actually, it is quite impossible to grasp the meaning of this first statement in the twentieth paragraph of the *Humani generis* unless we take direct cognizance of the fact that Our Lord remains always as the Supreme Teacher within His Church. The authoritative definitions and the declarations of the Catholic Church are not like the resolutions of some mere learned society or professional group. They are the continuing doctrinal directions given by Our Lord, through the instrumentality of the *ecclesia docens,* within His kingdom on earth. They serve to enlighten and guide the disciples of Christ during their period of pilgrimage on this earth in such a way that they may arrive safely in the Church's *patria* of heaven. Frequently this process involves, and involves necessarily, the acceptance or rejection of some opinionative propositions. Frequently it would happen that, in an existent status of science or of culture, the acceptance of some opinion or the rejection of another opinion would endanger the integrity of the faith itself among the people of God. It is in such cases that Our Lord, through the instrumentality of His servants in the *ecclesia docens,* commands His followers to adopt one opinion or to reject another, precisely as an opinion. The modification of these declarations, when and if such modification ever comes, in no way violates the infallibility of the Church since the doctrine

in question was never presented as irrevocable and infallible teaching.

The second sentence in this twentieth paragraph of the encyclical has great importance for modern students of sacred theology. It affirms that the encyclicals are organs of the Holy Father's *magisterium ordinarium*, and that the promise Our Lord made to His apostles (and through them to their successors in the *ecclesia docens*) that "He who hears you, hears me,"[2] applies to the *magisterium ordinarium* just as truly as it applies to the solemn judgments issued by the Holy Father himself or by the *ecclesia docens* as a whole. This same sentence likewise adds the comment that most of the statements which the faithful are obligated to accept from the encyclicals have already been allocated within the field of Catholic doctrine on some other title. In other words, the *Humani generis* takes cognizance of the fact that no individual pontifical letter is composed entirely (or even in great part) of assertions which have never before been set forth authoritatively by the *ecclesia docens*.

In a general way, the theological literature dealing with the Church's infallible and authoritative teaching power has tended to restrict the term "ordinary and universal *magisterium*" to the teachings of the residential bishops of the Catholic Church scattered throughout the world and united with the Roman Pontiff. The terminology of these volumes left little room for any study of the ordinary *magisterium* of the Roman Pontiff himself. Occasionally we encounter some theological writer careless enough to deny that the Holy Father can teach infallibly other than by *solemn* judgment or definition.[3] For the most part, however, there is very little comment at all about the Roman Pontiff's *magisterium ordinarium*. Hence the declaration of the *Humani generis* to the effect that teaching presented authoritatively (that is, in such a way that Catholics are obliged in conscience to accept it and to adopt it as their own) in the papal encyclicals comes to us by way of the *magisterium ordinarium* is definitely a contribution to modern theological thought.

[2] *Luke*, 10:16.

[3] One writer on theological subjects who made this mistake is Antoine Chevasse, in his essay, "La véritable conception de l'infaillibilité pontificale," in the symposium *Église et unité* (Lille, 1948), pp. 80 ff.

The Vatican Council had taught that a dogma of the faith is a truth which the Church finds contained in either of the two sources of divine revelation and which it presents as divine revelation that men must accept as such. It specified that this presentation might be made either in a solemn judgment or by the Church's ordinary and universal *magisterium*. Most of the manuals took this term "universal" to mean the teaching of the apostolic college of the Catholic Church as it is scattered throughout the world. In other words, they considered the word as applying to a *magisterium* that was universal in the sense that it was acting over the face of the entire earth at the same time. They acknowledged that such a *magisterium universale et ordinarium* could be the organ by which a dogma of the Catholic faith might be presented to the people of Jesus Christ, and they pointed to the dogma of the Church's own infallibility as a teaching that is proposed to the members of the universal Church militant in exactly that fashion.

Now it is a dogma of the Church, presented as such by the Vatican Council itself, that the Holy Father enjoys the same infallibility in defining doctrines about faith and morals that the universal Church (or the entire *ecclesia docens*) possesses. Thus, since the entire *ecclesia docens* (the residential bishops of the Catholic Church united with their head, St. Peter's successor in the See of Rome) can define a dogma either in a solemn judgment (when they are gathered together in an oecumenical council) or in an ordinary manner (when they are actually resident in their own dioceses throughout the world), it follows that the Holy Father himself can speak "ex cathedra" and define a dogma either in solemn judgment (as in the cases of the definitions of Our Lady's Immaculate Conception and her glorious bodily Assumption) or by some ordinary means, as, for example, in an encyclical letter.

In such a case, the Holy Father's teaching is universal. He exercises, according to the divine constitution of the Church itself, a true and episcopal jurisdiction over every one of the faithful and over every one of the other pastors within the Church militant. Thus there is nothing whatsoever to prevent the *magisterium ordinarium* of the Holy Father from being considered precisely as a *magisterium universale*. It is *de fide* that the Church's *magis-*

*terium ordinarium et universale* can be the vehicle for the definition and presentation of a Catholic dogma. It is perfectly certain that this same *magisterium ordinarium et universale* can also be the vehicle or the organ of a definition within the field of the Church's secondary object of infallible teaching. The encyclicals of the Holy Father can be and actually are statements of this *magisterium.* Hence they may be documents in which a dogma is defined or a certain truth of Catholic doctrine (which, however, is not presented precisely as revealed) is brought to the people of God on earth. This is the truth upon which the *Humani generis* insists at this point. And, since the power to impose authoritatively what may be called an interpretatively conditional assent (an assent which is definitely below the order of real certitude and hence belongs within the field of the opinionative) necessarily accompanies the power to pronounce an infallible judgment, this statement of the *Humani generis* carries with it the necessary implication that the Holy Father can and does teach authoritatively in his encyclicals when he wishes to impose upon the faithful the obligation of accepting a proposition which he presents neither as *de fide* nor as theologically certain.

The *Humani generis* likewise adverts to the fact that, when a person hearkens to the authoritative teaching of the *ecclesia docens,* that person is actually hearkening to the voice of Our Lord Himself. Once again, it takes this means to remind us that the Church does not teach in this world other than as the instrument and the body of Jesus Christ. The man who quibbles about the Church's doctrinal authority is finding fault, in the last analysis, with the means by which Our Lord brings His divine truth to the children of men. There can be no intelligent appreciation about the Church's *magisterium* except where and insofar as this paramount fact is taken into consideration.

The last statement of the twentieth paragraph in the *Humani generis* contains one of the most valuable and important lessons of the entire encyclical. It answers a vitally basic question which must be considered before any practical appreciation of the Church's teaching can be given. The question is this: how can we tell that any given statement in a papal encyclical (or in any other document of the Church's *magisterium*) is one which Catholics are

bound in conscience to accept by reason of the authority of the document itself?

The *Humani generis* does not try to offer anything like a complete answer to this query. It contents itself here with pointing out one instance in which Catholics are definitely and obviously bound in conscience to give an inward assent to the teachings of a papal document. Such an instance occurs, according to the *Humani generis,* when the Holy Father takes the trouble to issue a pronouncement on a subject which has, up until the issuance of this particular document in which the pronouncement is contained, been considered as open to controversy.

Clearly nothing can be considered as open to question among Catholics where there has been a definite and direct word of the authoritative ecclesiastical *magisterium* on this subject. Hence the *res hactenus controversa* to which the *Humani generis* refers must be a question not as yet decided by the authority of the Holy See or of the *ecclesia docens* as a whole. The point established in the encyclical is that when the Holy Father, *data opera,* issues a statement on this matter, it can no longer legitimately be considered as still open to debate among theologians. This remains true even where the *sententia* pronounced by the Roman Pontiff is not put forward as irrevocable, where, in other words, the contradictory of the teaching asserted is to be condemned with a theological censure less than *de fide* or *erronea.*

All that is required in this instance is that the pontifical document should put forward a judgment on a question which has hitherto been considered as undecided, that it should make a definite statement *(sententiam ferre)* which would be contradictory to or incompatible with some of the opinions previously expressed on this question by theologians. Nothing is said about the necessity of any particular formulae. The intention of the Pontiff to settle the question (either finally and irrevocably, by a declaration that this truth is *de fide* or at least that it is *doctrina certa,* or by an interpretatively conditional and opinionative judgment, according to which the contradictory of the teaching given would be qualified as *temeraria*), is established by the very fact that the Pontiff, in one of his official documents or declarations, takes the trouble to make a pronouncement on the subject. Nothing more is needed.

An example of this procedure is to be found in the treatment

of the question about the immediate source of episcopal jurisdiction in the Holy Father's encyclical *Mystici corporis.* Prior to the appearance of that document there had been many excellent theologians who had contended that the residential bishops of the Catholic Church receive their jurisdictional authority immediately from Our Lord. A greater number of theologians (and writers *de iure publico ecclesiastico*) held, on the contrary, that these men received their powers from Our Lord through the Roman Pontiff, in such a way that they came immediately from the Holy Father. In the *Mystici corporis,* the Pope spoke of the residential bishops' ordinary power of jurisdiction as something *"immediate sibi ab eodem Pontifice Summo impertita."* That phrase was rightly taken as an indication that the controversy had been settled, once and for all. Where before the teaching that the bishops received their power of jurisdiction immediately from the Roman Pontiff had been qualified as *"communis,"* it now became known as *"doctrina certa."*[4] The fact that the Sovereign Pontiff had, as it were "gone out of his way," or "taken the trouble," to speak out on a question which had hitherto been regarded as controversial, was taken as an indication that he wished to put an end to the discussion.

In this particular case, the Holy Father expressed himself categorically. Speaking of the bishops' ordinary power of jurisdiction, he qualified it unconditionally as something received immediately from the Sovereign Pontiff. Hence the resulting note was *doctrina certa.* It would also have been within his power to impose this same teaching precisely as an opinionative judgment, and in this case the censure attached to the contradictory of this teaching would have been *ad minus temeraria.*

The fact that a question is thus treated by the Roman Pontiff is, according to the *Humani generis,* an indication that the Holy Father intends that this subject should no longer be considered as a question open to free debate among theologians. The theologians of the Catholic Church have always recognized the fact that an intention on the part of the Holy Father is requisite if the faithful are to be bound by the teaching contained in his official

[4] Cf. Msgr. Alfredo Ottaviani, in his *Institutiones iuris publici ecclesiastici,* 3rd edition (Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1947), I, 413; and also the discussion on this point in *AER,* CXXI, 3 (Sept. 1949), 210.

*acta*. Hitherto, however, there has been too much of a tendency to consider that such an intention would have to be manifested by some sort of formula, as, for instance, by the use of such terms as "define" or "declare." The *Humani generis* has put an end to this dangerous minimism. Henceforth Catholic theologians have no excuse for not recognizing the fact that a deliberate pontifical statement on a subject which has hitherto been rightly considered as open to debate, takes the matter treated out of this category and makes it a subject on which Catholic writers are bound to accept the judgment of Christ's Vicar on earth.

If the decision of the Holy Father be not irrevocable, the fact that the matter is no longer open to debate does not in any way prevent individual theologians from investigating the subject with a view of working towards a modification of the present Catholic position. There is always at least the absolute possibility that such investigation may eventually result in a modification of the opinion incumbent upon Catholics by reason of the authority of the Roman Pontiff. It is wrong, however, to teach or to advocate the now reproved position. If the decision is irrevocable, but only in the sense that the Holy Father has placed this teaching within the category of *doctrina certa* (but not *doctrina de fide*), then the theologian is free to argue about the possibility of a *de fide* or dogmatic definition of this point, but he is definitely not free to teach or to hold that the doctrine set forth by the Holy Father can be rejected or modified at all. No teaching is set forth as certain unless it has been defined as true, unless there is no possibility, no fear or danger, that the opposite may turn out to be true.

Joseph Clifford Fenton

*The Catholic University of America*
*Washington, D. C.*

# Answers to Questions

## THE ROSARY ON THE RADIO

*Question 1:* If a group in a home are participating in the recitation of the rosary over the radio, in such wise that they say only the second part of the Our Fathers and Hail Marys—the first part of these prayers being recited by the person or persons broadcasting—do they gain the indulgences attached to the rosaries they hold in their hands (or have on their persons, if circumstances make it difficult to finger the beads) or even the indulgences attached to the rosary of the person broadcasting?

*Question 2:* If the broadcast, with the first part of the prayers, is actually made from a transcription of a rosary previously broadcast or recorded, can the indulgences be gained by those listeners who only recite the second part of the prayers?

*Answer 1:* The chief difficulty about the gaining of indulgences when the rosary is recited in this manner centers about the prescription of Canon Law which says: "For the gaining of indulgences it suffices to recite the prayer alternately *with a companion*" (canon 934, § 3). Now, can the person broadcasting the first part of the Our Fathers and the Hail Marys be correctly designated the *companion* of those who are reciting the other part of these prayers in their homes, perhaps hundreds of miles away? I seriously doubt it. Consequently, I also doubt if the radio participants can gain the indulgences which may be attached to the broadcaster's rosary, on the principle that they are reciting the prayer *in common* with him (cf. Damen, *Theologia moralis* [Turin, 1947], II, n. 1151). But I believe that the difficulty can easily be solved if, in every group participating in the broadcast rosary, one (at least) of the participants holds a rosary and recites the first part of the prayers with the broadcaster.

*Answer 2:* There is still more reason to doubt the possibility of gaining the rosary indulgences if the first part of the prayers is broadcast from a transcription or recording of the voice of the one who leads in the recitation of the rosary. Surely, if the prayer

is transmitted in this manner, it is advisable that one (at least) of the participants recite the first part of the prayers and have an indulgenced rosary.

It must not be inferred from what has been said that I have any intention of disparaging the recitation of the rosary by radio. On the contrary, I believe that great blessings will come to our land if the atmosphere is, so to say, sanctified by the frequent repetition of the praises of the Mother of God. But when there is question of indulgences, it is surely the more prudent course to be certain that all the conditions prescribed by the Church for the gaining of these precious supernatural gifts are fulfilled.

## PROBLEMS OF WAR

*Question 1:* What should be the course of action for a soldier who is commanded to do something which he knows is opposed to the law of God—for example, to drop a bomb on a residential section of a city, where there are no legitimate military targets?

*Question 2:* What advice is a Catholic chaplain to give to a soldier who submits a problem of this nature to him for a decision?

*Question 3:* Is it permissible for a man to enter military service when he knows that tactics opposed to God's law are sometimes employed.

*Answer 1:* If a soldier is commanded by his superiors to do something which he knows is contrary to the law of God, he must refuse to obey the order. Even if he were to be punished by death, he would not be permitted to do something forbidden by the divine law, such as a direct attack on non-combatants. It is worthy of note that, at least in a veiled manner, the tribunal of Nuremberg upheld the principle that the fact that a subject obeyed the command of his superior did not exonerate him if the deed was an atrocious violation of the laws of humanitarianism. It is to be hoped that, if a similar case ever arises in our country, the same principle will be upheld, in such wise that a soldier will not be penalized if he refuses to obey a command that he feels in conscience to be contrary to the law of God. However, if a soldier is in doubt about the lawfulness of a command—for example, if he is told to drop a bomb on a military target and is uncertain whether or not the concomitant harm to non-combatants will be

too great to justify the procedure—he should obey the command, since the duty of obedience takes precedence, and the subject may disobey only when he is *certain* that what is commanded is immoral.

*Answer 2:* When a soldier submits to the chaplain a problem concerning the morality of a mission assigned to him, it is the chaplain's duty to give him a definite answer, if such an answer can be given. Thus, if the soldier inquires about the lawfulness of a direct attack on non-combatants, he can be told that this is contrary to God's law. However, when a chaplain is not consulted about an intended military measure, he is ordinarily not bound to express his judgment on its moral aspect—even though it is certainly forbidden by the divine law—if it is evident that a protest will be futile.

*Answer 3:* Since not all the tactics employed in the armed service are immoral, it would not be sinful for a man to enlist, as long as he is resolved not to take part himself in any sinful operations. But, in view of the fact that there is grave probability of another World War, it is most advisable that Catholics who enter the military or naval forces be instructed in the principles of their faith concerning what is allowed and what is forbidden in warfare by the law of God, and be explicitly told that in case of a conflict between the divine law and a military order they must obey the divine law.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

---

## DISPOSING OF EASTER CANDLE

*Question:* Kindly advise me what to do with the Paschal candle after it is no longer required in the sanctuary by liturgical law.

*Answer:* If the candle has not been burned down very much it can be carefully wrapped and set aside for use the following year. However, at that time new grains must be used for the Holy Saturday ceremony. On the other hand, the *Ephemerides liturgicae* (1902) suggests that it is not the least improper to allow the Paschal candle to be consumed during the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. However, the grains of incense should be removed and the candle should not be placed in the same position in the sanctuary where it was held in prominence during the Easter season.

## DISTRIBUTION OF HOLY COMMUNION

*Question:* One of the priests always assists the celebrant of the Mass in distributing Holy Communion. He begins immediately after the Consecration of the Mass. Do both the celebrant of the Mass and the one assisting him say the full prayers for distribution of Holy Communion, or just the one helping the celebrant?

*Answer:* "It is, obviously, unbecoming to give Holy Communion at an altar where another priest is celebrating Mass, but it is permissible in case of necessity" (O'Connell, *The Celebration of Mass*, II, 155). In such case as our inquirer proposes the priest helping should carry out the full rite of the administration of Holy Communion outside of Mass, saying all the prayers and giving the blessing. The blessing is imparted even if a Requiem Mass should be in progress, since the case suggested is a ceremony quite apart from and independent of Mass. The fact that the priest assisting in the distribution of Holy Communion says the prayers does not in any way whatsoever alter the rubrics for the celebrant of the Mass.

## VIGIL OF PENTECOST

*Question:* Is it necessary to say the prophecies when saying the Mass for the vigil of Pentecost? Even if there is a sufficiency of water in the baptismal font, is it necessary to bless more water on the vigil of Pentecost? What is the significance of blessing the water on this vigil?

*Answer:* (a) Only at the principal Mass of the day are the prophecies, litanies and the blessing of the font observed. At all other Masses, Mass begins as usual without any special ceremonies. (b) Fr. Fortescue states that "in all churches which have a font it must be blessed today. This is a strict obligation, even though a sufficient supply of the water blessed on Holy Saturday is still available." S.R.C. no. 3331 reads that "blessing of the Baptismal Font is of precept in all Parish Churches, notwithstanding any custom whatsoever to the contrary." (c) On this vigil, those who were prevented from receiving the Sacrament of Baptism at Easter time were presented. Likewise, those who had been thought insufficiently instructed or tried in their religion were now presented for Baptism. The Paschal candle was brought forth

again in order to impress the catechumens with the love and respect they should have for the Redeemer. The rites for Holy Saturday were repeated at this time and the Mass at which they assisted began at daybreak. The numbers baptised on this occasion were not nearly as large as at Easter time but the Church desired to impress the importance of the sacrament upon her new members.

## DIVINE PRAISES

*Question:* On the altar card published by one of our leading ecclesiastical firms, after the Divine Praises is inserted the following indulgenced prayer: "May the Heart of Jesus in the Most Blessed Sacrament be praised etc." Is it proper to say this prayer at the end of the Benediction of the Most Blessed Sacrament? Or is it a pious innovation?

*Answer:* Before the *Tantum Ergo* is sung, any approved hymn, litany or antiphon, either in Latin or the vernacular may be sung. In some countries the Divine Praises are neither recited nor sung. In many places the prayer to which our inquirer refers is added to the Divine Praises. This prayer is found in the collection *Preces et pia opera* which has the full approval of the Holy See.

## BLESSING OF HOMES

*Question:* According to canon 4626, the right of blessing houses in the manner set forth in liturgical books on Holy Saturday or on any other day sanctioned by the custom of the place is a function reserved to the local pastor. A certain national parish in our area always had the custom of having their homes blessed during the Christmas season instead of the prescribed Easter time. It is presumed that the form *Benedictio domorum extra tempus paschale*, is to be used. Is the pastor's permission needed for this form is not reserved to the pastor?

*Answer:* Whether in paschal time or not, the permission of the local pastor should be obtained. Common decency and courtesy demand this to say nothing about the law. The season of the year does not enter into the case. The pastor's permission is just as necessary outside of paschal time as during the Easter season.

## MUSICAL PROBLEM

*Question:* What is to be thought of the practice of using the national anthem or similar patriotic numbers at the conclusion of Mass? Has the "Fatima Song" now on the "Hit Parade" any ecclesiastical approval? Is it appropriate for singing at Mass or at a novena?

*Answer:* (a) We recognize the fact that our national anthem is sung in church at functions attended by high government or military officials and personnel. However, the law is clear, or at least the mind of the Church is expressed in the Regulations approved by Pope Leo XIII and published by the Congregation of Sacred Rites, Sept. 21, 1884, "It is absolutely forbidden that any music should be performed in Church, however brief it may be, which contains themes drawn from theatrical works . . . or profane pieces such as national hymns, popular songs etc." (b) The second inquiry finds its answer in the above response. Pope Pius X in his *Motu proprio* states what we look for in church music. "It must be holy and must therefore exclude all secular spirit, not only in itself, but in the manner in which it is presented. It must be true art, for otherwise it will be impossible for it to exercise on the minds of its listeners that efficacy which the Church aims at obtaining." The "Fatima Song" is to be considered a passing fancy, something which will not live and which is entirely out of place at any ecclesiastical service, liturgical or otherwise. At the present writing the "Fatima Song" has already lost its appeal.

## CHAPLAIN'S DILEMMA

*Question:* I am resident chaplain at the Sister's Hospital. I say Mass for the Sisters in the hospital chapel daily except Saturday morning when I say it in the convent chapel in order to renew the Sacred Species. The convent chapel is about a two or three minute walk from the hospital chapel. Is it in order to have the Blessed Sacrament reserved in the convent chapel?

*Answer:* This situation exists in many places and under the same circumstances. To most priests and particularly to chaplains it all seems quite unnecessary. However, the solution of such a problem does not rest with the local chaplain but rather with the Ordinary.

## STOLE PROBLEMS

*Question:* When a priest exposes the Blessed Sacrament for Benediction and he himself is not the celebrant does he wear the stole deacon or priest style? What color stole is worn? When a priest receives Holy Communion as on Holy Thursday or Holy Saturday what color stole does he wear?

*Answer:* When a priest exposes the Blessed Sacrament and is not the celebrant he wears the stole priest style and not crossed over the shoulder, deacon fashion. He always wears a white stole or the color of the stole worn by the celebrant of Benediction. Should Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament follow immediately after sung Vespers or Compline, the priest exposing the Blessed Sacrament would wear the same color stole as the priest presiding at the liturgical hour. For receiving Holy Communion, the priest wears a stole the color of the vestments of the day or a white stole.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

---

### OUR LORD THE SOURCE OF HOLINESS IN THE CHURCH

Holiness begins from Christ. It is effected by Christ. For no act conducive to salvation can be performed unless it proceeds from Him as its supernatural cause. "Without me," He says, "you can do nothing." If we grieve and do penance for our sins, if with filial fear and hope we turn again to God, it is because He is leading us. Grace and glory flow from His unfathomed fullness. Our Saviour is continually pouring out His gifts of counsel, fortitude, fear, and piety, especially on the leading members of His body, so that the whole body may grow daily more and more in spotless holiness.

—Pope Pius XII, in his encyclical, *Mystici corporis.*

# Analecta

The March number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* reports the declaration of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation issued March 17[1] pointing to the already existing penalties to which the usurpers in Czechoslovakia and their accessories were and are subject. It spoke of the invasion of the Church's rights in that country and of the affronts offered ecclesiastical persons there. It recalled that local Ordinaries had been impeded in the discharge of the functions of their office and that their pastoral rights had been invaded. Moreover, it lamented the intrusion into benefices and even into curial offices of persons unlawfully appointed through the unwarranted presumption of laymen arrogating to themselves the right of interfering in the government of dioceses. It pointed to the duress practiced on the clergy and religious and to the imprisonment of members of the hierarchy and the citation of the latter to lay tribunals. Finally, it recorded the detention of the Archbishop of Prague in his residence and the total restriction placed on his exercise of authority, a policy of persecution ultimately climaxed in his banishment from his see and his archdiocese. It then listed the automatic reserved excommunications incurred by those who cite a bishop before a secular tribunal (can. 2341), who lay hands on a bishop (can. 2343, §3), who directly or indirectly recur to secular authority to prevent the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction (can. 2334, 2°), who conspire against ecclesiastical authority or attempt in any way to nullify its power, or who accept or retain any ecclesiastical office or benefits otherwise than in the manner warranted by the canons. The excommunication incurred by the delinquents belonging to the latter two categories was imposed by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Council issued June 29, 1950.[2]

On Feb. 25, 1951,[3] our Holy Father addressed a radio message to the faithful assembled at Kumasi, the Gold Coast, in observance of the first National Eucharistic Congress. In the introductory para-

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XLIII (1951), 173.
[2] *Ibid.*, XLII (1950), 601.
[3] *Ibid.*, XLIII (1951), 170.

graph he adverted to the fact that radio forged a new link uniting the tomb of the chief of the apostles with the majestic cathedral of St. Peter in historic Kumasi. He then proceeded to refer to the missionary zeal of the first members of the Society of African Missions who prepared the field for the establishment of an Apostolic Vicariate just fifty years before the Holy Year of 1950 when the Hierarchy of British West Africa was instituted. He emphasized the fact that it was the heroes of the past who made possible the Congress they were celebrating. Their Eucharistic Congress proclaimed their unity with the Holy See and their participation in the life of the Mystical Body, for their act of faith in adoration of the Blessed Sacrament is one that is shared by all Catholics throughout the world and their reception of Holy Communion enables the many to be one in Him whom they receive.

In accepting the credentials of the Envoy Extraordinary of the Republic of Liberia, Feb. 28, 1951,[4] our Holy Father adverted to the words of the Envoy that had quite properly emphasized the point that true religion and profound humaneness are not rivals, a truth bound up in the latter's reference to the fact that the Free and Sovereign Republic of Liberia was intent on taking its place among the Christian nations. The Pope expressed the hope that the membership and the organizations of the Catholic portion of the Liberian people might continue to be guaranteed that freedom of action to which they are entitled. He said that Catholics would surely know how to appreciate and make use of their acknowledged liberty for the advantage of their native land.

A congratulatory letter was sent by our Holy Father to His Eminence, Jules Cardinal Saliège, Archbishop of Toulouse, on the occasion of the silver jubilee of his episcopal consecration. The letter, dated Dec. 21, 1950,[5] authorized His Eminence to grant, after the pontifical ceremonies marking the observance, the papal blessing to the faithful present, carrying with it a plenary indulgence under the usual conditions.

Letters Apostolic of Feb. 18, 1951,[6] decreed the beatification of Blessed Alberico Crescitelli. The Letters recount that he was born on June 30, 1863, and ordained June 4, 1887, as a member of the missionary Institute of SS. Peter and Paul. On a visit to his home town of Altavilla, near Naples, he was confronted by an

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 169. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 164. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 159.

epidemic of cholera. He was given permission to labor among the afflicted there and did heroic work in comforting them. He was sent to China in April, 1888, and labored there until his martyrdom during the Boxer Rebellion in 1900. Our Holy Father paid a special tribute to the martyr's optimism as revealed in his letters, an attitude resulting from his perfect trust in the Providence of God. The allocution in which this tribute was bestowed was delivered on Feb. 19,[7] to those who had assembled in Rome to participate in the ceremonies of beatification.

Letters Apostolic of Sept. 20, 1950,[8] raised to the rank of a Minor Basilica the Church called "Corpus Domini" in Milan; and Letters Apostolic of July 31, 1950,[9] named as the principal Patron of the Archdiocese of Chieti our Blessed Lady under the title of the Blessed Virgin of Miracles.

An Apostolic Constitution of Dec. 12, 1950,[10] raised the Titular See of Sion from the rank of an episcopal to that of an archiepiscopal see. Under the terms of the recent agreement between the Holy See and the Spanish Government, the Military Vicar is entitled to the rank of archbishop. The present incumbent, previously Titular Bishop of Sion, has thus become Titular Archbishop of that See.

The Apostolic Prefecture of Pingliang was raised to the rank of a Diocese by an Apostolic Constitution of June 24, 1950.[11] A new Diocese of Palai has been established in the territory of the Syro-Malabar Rite, consisting of territory taken from the Diocese of Changanacherry, in virtue of an Apostolic Constitution dated July 25, 1950.[12] An Apostolic Constitution of Aug. 10, 1950,[13] established a new Apostolic Prefecture of Taichung in the Island of Formosa, consisting of territory taken from the Apostolic Prefecture of Kaohsung. An Apostolic Constitution of Aug. 11, 1950,[14] established a new Prelature *nullius*, that of Catabato and Sulù, in territory formerly belonging to the Diocese of Zamboanga in the Philippine Islands.

A decree of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, dated Jan. 28, 1951,[15] provided for the modification of the title of three Apostolic Vicariates in Egypt: that of Alexandria in Egypt

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 165.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 157.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 156.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 154.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 145.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 147.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 150.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 152.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 176.

(in place of that merely of Egypt): that of Heliopolis (in place of that of the Delta of the Nile); and that of Port Said (in place of that of the Suez Canal).

The Sacred Congregation of the Council, in a solution of a doubt, affirmed, on Nov. 11, 1950,[16] the obligation not merely of celebrating a solemn Mass in obedience to the command of the bishop for the observance of the anniversary days of his election, transfer, and consecration, but also of applying the Mass for the bishop.

A decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, dated Feb. 11, 1951,[17] approved two miracles in the Cause of the Venerable Julian Maunoir.

The March number of the *Acta* lists among appointments to the hierarchy the naming of Most Rev. Joseph Lennox Federal, D.D., as Titular Bishop of Appiaria and Auxiliary of Salt Lake,[18] and of Most Rev. Thomas J. McDonnell, D.D., already Titular Bishop of Sela, as Coadjutor of Wheeling.[19]

RECENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS ANNOUNCED IN THE *ACTA APOSTOLICAE SEDIS*

*Domestic Prelates of His Holiness:*

Dec. 13, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Arthur J. Avard, Joseph M. Congedo, John J. Corrigan, Joseph M. Egan, George C. Ehardt, Bonaventure J. Filitti, Walter P. Kellenberg, William R. Kelly, George A. Kreidel, John J. Maguire, John D. McGowan, John S. Middleton, Edward R. Moore, John J. Moylan, Robert B. Mulcahey, Francis J. Murphy, Michael P. O'Shea, John J. Scally, Joseph B. Scully, Francis Szubinski, and Edward J. Waterson, of the Archdiocese of New York.

Dec. 20, 1949: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edwin J. Kennedy, of the Archdiocese of San Francisco.

Feb. 18, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgr. James J. Lynch, of the Archdiocese of New York.

June 17, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Adolph Marx, of the Diocese of Corpus Christi.

June 28, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Thomas J. Coleman, Louis G. Fey, Anthony Goebel, and Henry A. Hanses, of the Diocese of Covington.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 177.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 178.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 175.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 176.

Aug. 13, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Robert E. Brennan, John K. Clarke, Daniel P. Collins, John J. Devlin, Patrick J. Dignan, James E. Dolan, Victor J. Follen, John I. Gallagher, Martin C. Keating, Leo J. Murphy, Thomas F. O'Carroll, Michael F. O'Connor, Raymond J. O'Flaherty, Michael O'Halloran, George M. Scott, Joseph J. Truxaw, and Edward V. Wade, of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

Aug. 17, 1950: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Felix F. Burant, Ignatius Cirelli, James P. Kelly, Edward A. Loehr, Richard J. Pigott, Arthur J. F. Quinn, Bernard J. Rourke, Patrick J. Temple, and George J. Zentgraf, of the Archdiocese of New York.

*Privy Chamberlains Supernumerary of His Holiness:*

May 23, 1950: Very Rev. Msgr. Joseph A. Wagner, of the Diocese of Joliet.

June 17, 1950: Very Rev. Msgr. Francis J. Kasper, of the Diocese of Corpus Christi.

July 28, 1950: Very Rev. Msgrs. Joseph A. Lubrecht and Oscar L. Poole, of the Diocese of Covington.

Aug. 13, 1950: Very Rev. Msgrs. John Bell, Anthony J. Brouwers, and William E. North, of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

Aug. 17, 1950: Very Rev. Msgrs. Michael A. Buckley, John M. Costello, John M. Fleming, Joseph C. Krug, Gustav J. Schultheiss, and Charles M. Walsh, of the Archdiocese of New York.

*Honorary Chamberlain Supernumerary with the Cap and Sword:*

Apr. 17, 1950: Melvin J. Thiel, of the Diocese of Galveston.

*Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:*

Aug. 13, 1950: Adolph Camarillo, Thomas B. Cosgrove, Thomas A. Dockweiler, and Ernest Duque, of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

*Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:*

May 18, 1950: Patton George Kraker, of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe.

Sept. 25, 1950: Martin J. Gadient and James M. Hutchinson, of the Diocese of Davenport.

*Knight of the Order of St. Sylvester, Pope:*

June 24, 1950: Edward J. Kirchner, of the Archdiocese of Washington.

JEROME D. HANNAN

*The Catholic University of America*
*Washington, D. C.*

# Book Reviews

MORAL ASPECTS OF DISHONESTY IN PUBLIC OFFICE. By William Joseph King. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1949. Pp. xiii +219. $2.50.

This is one of the series of doctoral dissertations published at The Catholic University of America. The subject of the thesis is well chosen since theological works which treat of the moral obligations of the Catholic in his role of public official are scarce. The present treatise concerns itself with the immorality of such acts as legislative abuses, the purchase of immunity, patronage, etc.

The purpose of the study is to examine from the viewpoint of the moral theologian those instances in which public officials use their offices in a manner detrimental to the common good, due to a selfish desire to further their own interests. Material for discussion is selected from those instances of corruption that have been brought forth already in public investigations. By reason of the limited scope of the dissertation the following restricted definition of graft is given: "Graft is the abuse, by a public official, of his control over the power and resources of government for the purpose of some private or party interest."

I believe that one of the most important sections of the book is that part which deals with "the purchase of immunity." Immunity from the law is purchased not only from police officials and those having positions which involve the enforcement of law, but also from such officials as the tax assessor, the customs official, etc. Selling of immunity may take place also in the administrative phase of the government. In this second division we find a treatment of subjects not often considered, for instance, the purchase of immunity from the building inspector, the health department officer, and various licensing agencies. It is pointed out that all those who try to purchase immunity have one thing in common: all are engaged in a profitable enterprise that operates contrary to the laws; because they are violating the laws, these people turn to law enforcement agencies to purchase the necessary protection for themselves so that they may continue to carry on their illicit but profitable business. It is the author's purpose to show that such activity is a violation of the virtue of commutative justice. This is certainly not the more common opinion, but it is a view that is being proposed more and more by moral theologians. Moreover, it seems that this view, at least intrinsically, has the more solid foundation. In this attempt to establish the view that the acceptance

of graft is a violation of commutative justice the author maintains that the public official when accepting an office agrees to perform all the duties of that office. This agreement constitutes what can be termed "a quasi-contract." Fr. King concludes: "Inasmuch as the police officer is bound at least by force of a quasi-contract, or a contract implied in fact, actions on his part in variance with the duties laid upon him by virtue of his office entail a violation of commutative justice" (p. 92).

Theologians have minimized the strength of this argument because of the adverse argument which is commonly adduced. Fr. King takes into consideration the opposite theory as proposed by various theologians. Their chief argument is based on a decision of the Sacred *Paenitentiaria* in a case which they consider to be parallel. It seems to me that the author shows clearly that there is no parallel between that case and the case under discussion here. The differences between the two cases are such that it does not seem one would be justified in making use of the decision of the Sacred *Paenitentiaria* to decide the present case. The Sacred *Paenitentiaria* in deciding the case of the *contractus turpis* urged but did not make restitution obligatory. Those authors who maintain that the selling of immunity is a *contractus turpis* argue that restitution may be counseled but cannot be made a matter of strict obligation. But Fr. King points out that in the case of the ordinary *contractus turpis* there is no enfringement of the right of a third party, whereas the rights of the state are injured by the selling of immunity. This difference alone is sufficiently important to maintain that the decision of the Sacred *Paenitentiaria* cannot be applied to the case at issue.

The administrative department of the government, whether it be federal or local, affords many opportunities for selling immunity. Under the administrative government the author considers the obligations of building inspectors, health department officials, and the various licensing agencies. The author is to be complimented for his thorough treatment of the subject.

The sixth chapter is devoted to discussing the injustices committed by "patronage," that is, the selling of positions, the payment of tribute or "kick-backs," etc.

Having studied the abuses found in the administrative, legislative, and judicial functions of the government the writer turns his attention to the other instances when the state enters into contractual relations with the individual and with corporations. The abuses connected with the purchases made by the government are well known. For the most part the examples given are actual cases. It is to be noted that in all of these cases the author would require restitution on the part of the officials.

The book will be welcomed particularly by those teaching the tract, *De justitia*. Priests who have been confronted with cases dealing with "graft" will find in this book a clear presentation of the view which demands that the person accepting the graft make restitution.

KENNETH B. MOORE, O.Carm.

TESTIMONIA DE ASSUMPTION BEATAE VIRGINIS MARIAE EX OMNIBUS SAECULIS. By Carlo Balic, O.F.M. Rome: Academia Mariana, Vol. I: Testimonia ex aetate post Concilium Tridentinum, 1950. Pp. xii + 416; viii + 535.

The Holy Father's definition, last year, of the dogma of Our Lady's bodily Assumption into heaven climaxed one of the most important and rewarding corporate efforts in the history of Catholic theology. Theologians as a group had enriched the literature of their science with works of great and enduring value in preparation for the definition. Some of these works, like that of Hentrich and Von Moos, have immediate repercussions in the field of fundamental dogmatic theology. They have significantly forwarded the Catholic teaching about the workings of the ordinary *magisterium* of the universal *ecclesia docens*. Other writings, like those of Jugie and Roschini, have greatly enriched the field of Mariology in general, even while they concentrated on the doctrine of the Assumption.

Fr. Balic's two-volume work belongs to this latter category. It goes over the material covered previously by Fr. Jugie in his historico-doctrinal study, *La mort et l'Assomption de la Sainte Vierge*. Fr. Balic disputes what he considers the minimizing tendencies of Fr. Jugie, particularly in the patristic section of his book. He has succeeded in correcting some individual conclusions drawn by Fr. Jugie from texts and sometimes from the lack of evidence at certain periods. Nevertheless, in the treatment of individual texts, the newer work occasionally fails to achieve the critical nicety shown by Jugie in his evaluations.

In the field of modern theology, however, Fr. Balic's work is much superior to anything else in its class. So intensely effective is his treatment of the theologians since the Council of Trent, that this book will serve to illustrate the genuine theological progress during this era. Fortunately Fr. Balic has included adequate treatment of contemporary writers in his work.

He has given his fellow theologians an invaluable work. Through the two volumes of this magnificent new opus, the theological students of our time can obtain an unexcelled and scientifically accurate understanding of the literary history of the divinely revealed doctrine of Our Lady's Assumption.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

GESCHICHTE DES ALTEN TESTAMENTS. I HALFTE. Die Heilige Scrift des Alten Testaments. Ergänzungsband II. By Dr. Paul Heinisch. Bonn: Hanstein, 1949. Pp. 200.

This is the first half of a supplementary volume to the series of highly esteemed commentaries popularly known as the "Bonner Bibel." It deals with the events from the creation to the reign of Ochozias (842 B.C.). It differs from other books of the same type by devoting a special section to the religious beliefs prevalent in each epoch of Hebrew history. This will be highly appreciated by theologians because it will enable them to trace the development of revelation. The cultural conditions prevailing in some epochs also receive special attention. The writer shows a thorough acquaintance with the data of anthropology, archaeology, and modern sciences bearing upon the Bible. Though his allusions to these subjects are necessarily brief, they are adequate for his purpose; references to the pertinent literature provide opportunity for more intensive study.

Heinisch's principle of interpretation is: the teaching of the Old Testament on religion and morals is absolutely true; this teaching may, however, be clothed in figurative and symbolic language. Even seemingly historical narratives may only be essentially true. The kernel of truth may be encased in symbolism or presented with fictional and anachronistic details.

This principle of interpretation is especially prominent in the treatment of some aspects of Pentateuchal history. It is applied scarcely at all in the discussion of the events subsequent to the first eleven chapters of Genesis. Thus the accounts of the creation of Adam and Eve are figurative or symbolical; they do not exclude monogenistic evolution. Heinisch thinks that the formation of Eve from the rib of Adam merely teaches that the wife should be very dear to the husband because a rib is near to the heart. This sounds somewhat quaint, if not naive.

In general the historicity of the books of the Old Testament is vigorously defended; the writer usually reproduces their contents without comment. However, Heinisch thinks that Genesis contains irreconcilable discrepancies, which he attributes to the combination of divergent traditions. But he maintains that these discrepancies do not militate against the essential verity of the facts. He considers Moses to be the author only of the substratum of the Pentateuch; new laws, historical traditions, lists, chronological data, numbers, and interpretative remarks were added by later editors.

The paragraphs on the following topics are especially valuable: the Pharaoh of the Exodus, the Book of the Covenant, the laws relating to worship, the development of the Mosaic Law, the relation of this Law

to other codes of the Near East. Outside of these and other features previously mentioned, the book contains little that is unusual. It will prove a useful manual to all concerned with the study of the Old Testament.

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

GREAT CATHOLIC FESTIVALS. By James L. Monks, S.J. New York: Henry Schuman, Inc., 1951. Pp. 110. $2.50.

THE POWER OF THE SACRAMENTS. By the Most Reverend George Grente. Translated by Sister Mary Madonna, C.S.C. New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1951. Pp. xi + 236. $3.00.

LIVING THE MASS. By R. Desplanques, S.J. Translated by Sister M. Constance, S.C.H. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1951. Pp. xx + 180. $2.75.

In an attempt that might easily have gone sprawling because it ambitions so much within a small compass, Fr. Monks of the theological faculty of Weston College has served the divine liturgy well. His small handbook (a gem of creative bookmaking, by the way), is one in a series of ten in which religious festivals are discussed by authors of orthodox, heterodox, and no particular persuasions. Taking six feasts, Christmas, The Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost, Corpus Christi, and Mary's Assumption, the author describes the mysteries commemorated, their liturgical history in both East and West, present practice as stipulated in the official service books, and modern and ancient paraliturgies or folk customs. It is by no means the *mélange* it may sound. The Fathers are quoted effectively, as also are the Missal and the Divine Office; then follow items such as the history of *Las Posadas* and the veneration of the miraculous corporal of Orvieto, with minor excursions that tell, for instance, of the substitution of pussy willows for blessed palms in Austria and Germany. A nice balance is struck throughout between what Catholics believe and what Catholics do about their belief (with and without the encouragement of a universal Mother). Occasionally the author deals with something like the Paschal controversy with a necessary absence of complexity, but you will not easily "catch him out" in inaccuracy or lack of perfect taste.

Archbishop Grente of Le Mans, the author of thirty volumes including nine of *discours* and a member of the French Academy, has produced a treatise for preachers and layfolk that can best be described as Gallic-exhortatory. After the New Testament and the Catechism of Trent, Bossuet seems to be the theologian most quoted. Renan and Pascal make contributions, while Pasteur's alleged Breton peasant